

A MERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. VI, 4.

WHOLE NO. 24.

I.—THE REDUCTION OF EI TO ī IN HOMER.

From the fact that there is no great physiological dissimilarity between the diphthongal elements *e* and *i*, their combination in a diphthong *kar' ἐπικράτειαν* (*ei, ēi*) has not been able to maintain itself under all conditions, suffering a change, which, in the case of *ēi*, is assumed to have taken place in the proethnic stage of the Indo-European languages. Johannes Schmidt (K. Z. XXVII 305) has attempted to prove that before a consonant or as a final sound, -*ēi* was deprived of its weaker element, *ē* standing as the representative of the compound (*rās*, Lat. *rēs*, from *rēi+s*; locative -*ē*), while *ai* and *oi* were preserved in their entirety when exposed to similar conditions (*supatyāl tāis*; *populoi vīlku*). However this may be, in the case of *ei*, where the resemblance between the component parts of the diphthong was greater than in that of *ēi*, an assimilation of *e* and *i* took place (the latter sound overpowering the former), which, in Greek, according to Brugmann (Griechische Grammatik, 1885, §15), produced a closed *ē* sound by the end of the fifth century. This closed *ē* sound yielded at an early date in Boeotia ("circa 400," Larfeld, Sylloge, p. xxxiii) and elsewhere in Greece in the third century¹ to that *i* sound which we meet with in Latin and Gothic as the remnant of the ancient diphthong. In early Latin, it is true, we find traces of *ei* (*deico*, etc.), but in general Latin represents a stage of vocalization in which the ancient diphthongal sounds have lost their primitive coloring, many having become monophthongic. In Gothic the constant representation of the *i* sound by *ei*, and the occasional use of the same combination to express *eu* and *η*, show that

¹ In Attica the change became general about 100 B. C.

the Gothic diphthong represents the itacistic pronunciation current in Greece at the time of Ulfilas. As regards Brugmann's theory, I think it more probable that the spurious diphthong ($\epsilon\imath$ from $\epsilon+\epsilon$ or from compensatory lengthening) was the forerunner of the change, and that it drew in its train the genuine diphthong ($\epsilon\imath$ from $\epsilon+\imath$ or proethnic $e\imath$), since the genuine diphthong continued to be a diphthong at least in Attica during the fourth and third centuries. About 380 B. C. the spurious $\epsilon\imath$ became diphthongal in character.¹ Whether Brugmann's view or the other here presented is correct, is, however, immaterial to the subject under discussion, which does not purport to give a detailed explanation of the physiology of the sounds $\epsilon\imath$ and η .

In the first volume of Bezzemberger's *Beiträge* (1877), Gustav Meyer has collected from Homer and elsewhere a number of supposed examples of this reduction of $\epsilon\imath$ to τ ; and in his *Griechische Grammatik* (1880) he has not changed the view maintained in his earlier essay: that we find in so early an author as Homer unmistakable traces of this change.² Curtius was also of the same opinion, as may be learned from several passages of his *Etymology and Verbum*.³ The authority of the epigraphic monuments, as briefly given above, is thus placed in direct opposition to the authority of the Homeric text as understood by Meyer. In his Grammar Meyer commits the unpardonable error of comparing itacistic with Homeric forms, assuming that the former are more ancient than the latter because an τ found in Homer appears as $\epsilon\imath$ in inscriptions.

This paper has for its object a new and more thorough investigation of the cases claimed by Meyer and others as examples of the monophthongization of $\epsilon\imath$, so far as they are found in the text of the Homeric poems.

The well-known ablaut relations of $\epsilon\imath$ ($\epsilon\imath-\epsilon\bar{\imath}-\bar{\epsilon}$) have been treated in full by Saussure, G. Meyer, Bloomfield and others, and latterly (with especial reference to the Homeric forms) by myself in the

¹ After 380 there are but few traces of $\epsilon\imath$ for $\epsilon\imath$. The last example dates from the year 333.

² Frölde, in the third volume of the same journal, seeks (p. 9) to confirm Meyer's theory by adducing other instances.

³ Cauer's (*Studien*, VIII 252, 1875) assumption that $\epsilon\imath$ is produced from ϵ in early Attic by a "depravata pronuntiatio" is entirely without foundation. Nor can $\epsilon\imath$ from ϵ be explained as the modern German $e\imath$, M. H. G. \bar{e} , according to the theory of Kuhn (K. Z. XII 143), Scherer (*Gesch. der deutschen Sp.*² p. 39) and others, stimulated by Grein (1862).

treatise "Der Diphthong EI im Griechischen unter Berücksichtigung seiner Entsprechungen in Verwandten Sprachen" (Göttingen, 1885). The material here collected may serve as a supplement to my former paper, and at the same time it has caused me to modify my views of some few positions assumed there. Up to 1881 the prevailing theory was that in certain cases the transition of *ει* to *τ*, and through *τ* to *ī*, was to be adopted. In that year Osthoff proclaimed in the fourth volume of the *Morphologische Untersuchungen*, in a lengthy essay of 406 pages (without an index), his theory that *ei*, *i*, *ī* are proethnic in both root and suffix-syllables. It is impossible here to enter upon an elaborate criticism of this theory, which in reality is an attempt to overturn in part the hitherto received views concerning Indo-European vocalization. Its corollary is that the proethnic accent was not merely chromatic but also expiratory. *i*, *ī*, found in individual languages, owe their quantitative dissimilarity, he maintains, not to special laws active in these languages, but to the existence of a universal law antedating the separation of the various groups of the Indo-European family. This law produced three ablaut-gradations of the root: "low," $\lambda\bar{\iota}\pi$; "middle," $\lambda\iota\pi$; "high," $\lambda\iota\iota\pi$. According to Osthoff, therefore, all roots which have *i* or *ī* are equally ancient so far as the separate languages are concerned. The *i* root was developed from the *ī* root in the proethnic age. If a verb in Homer has *τ*, in Menander *ī*, the one has no quantitative connection with the other; both are equally ancient, and the difference between them is merely one of incidence; the *τ* happens to appear some six centuries before the *ī*. Throughout his entire book there is but little account taken of special or specific Greek laws, though compensatory lengthening finds here and there an unimportant place. Of itacism and of the power that certain consonantal sounds have to color or to lengthen a neighboring vowel there is but little mention. *κλίνω* is not from **κλίνγω*, Aiolic *κλίνω*, but is parallel, so far as the long vowel is concerned, to Old-Norse *hrín*, "touch," Germ. *hrinō*. *τίνω* and *cíno mi* have mere parallel forms of the same root-vowel. If a form with *EI* occurs on an early inscription, and Homer has *ī*, the Homeric form is original, and the claims of the *EI* to antiquity are cursorily dismissed. The phenomena that belong specifically to a language he does not investigate, and the individual development of a language in coloring its vowel-system he seems not to accept. Latin, Gothic and the various Germanic branches, which from the character of their vocalization do not

show the original diphthong *ei*,¹ are made to serve as parallels with their long *i*'s to any Greek or Sanskrit *i*. A language with the musical accent is judged by the same criterion as another which has the exspiratory or has mere survivals of the musical. There is thus no perspective in the book; one language, no matter what the age of its literary monuments, is placed on the same plane as another. A proethnic law which explains all the vowel-phenomena of each individual language is a thing as yet unheard of.² Do not the dialects of Greece assert their individuality in their treatment of palatalization? A dull uniformity is made to supplant the elasticity of Greek vocalization. Osthoff fails to see that it is no proof of the non-existence of an Homeric form with *EI* when he merely cites a supposed parallel *i* from Sanskrit. The enormous amount of material collected by Osthoff (pages 1-276) in support of his theory is in part worthless, as the laws formulated by him for its explanation are, to a great extent, laws dealing with his conception of sentence-accent, which he fails to illustrate adequately. Sentence-accent played no doubt an important rôle in coloring Indo-European forms, but its laws have hitherto not been conclusively made known. The old and, to my thinking, well-established theory of accentuation whereby, for example, the *E* sound is expelled by a shifting of the accent, is denied, and the new view proposed that *i* arose by assimilation of *ei*, *oi*, *ai*, etc., before a consonant when the *ei* did not have the accent; *i* from *i* if the *i* syllable became toneless. Itacism, in the general sense of the word, is therefore not a peculiarity of an individual language, it antedates the existence of all individual I. E. languages. *i u* before consonants arose, furthermore, from *ii uu* when followed by sonants. *ii uu* arose from the same assimilation of the *A* element as in *i u*, but remained uncontracted because the consonantal function of the second element was necessary. *i* before a sonant = *i* before consonant; *i* is from *ii* by

¹ We must except the few traces of *ei* in Old Latin, which, earlier than *ai*, *au*, *eu*, *oi*, *ou*, lost its diphthongal nature, as *deivos*, *quei*, *Apolenei*. Even these cases are placed in doubt by Stolz, Lateinische Gram. §37. *i* and *e* are expressed by *ei* sometimes, and *e* and *ei* are constantly confused.

² Osthoff's explanation of the phenomena of long and short vowels fails to recognize the significance for the I. E. vowel-system of disyllabic roots, the existence of which Saussure has rendered probable. Thus the weak form of ✓ *geyā* (to use the diacritical representation of Hübschmann, who in his "Indogermanisches Vocalsystem" attempts to mediate between Osthoff's and Saussure's theory,) is *ji*; of ✓ *peyā*, *pi*.

the loss of the sonant mora as in the case of *i* from *ī*. Such is in brief Osthoff's theory; those who desire a fuller explanation are recommended to the book itself. It is not the place here to discuss "conjectures about conjectures."

We have to deal with *ī*'s that are to be explained by the specific laws of Greek linguistics, with others that were produced by the action of laws of the Greek language, which laws operate also in cognate languages, and lastly with other instances where *ī* is Indo-European and found in Greek and elsewhere. It is not asserted that because an explanation for the *i*'s that are collected here is sought in Greek laws, the help of related languages not being neglected, a confusion is established between the science of Greek linguists and the science of Indo-European linguists. The one is embraced by the other. That there are many cases of I. E. *ī* in Homer is not denied, and there are *e. g.* some 60 proper names, some of which are property of cognate languages and contain an *ī* not yet explained.

The uncertainty attendant upon the explanation of Homeric forms is, of course, materially increased in the case of a sound which suffered itacism. This holds good to a greater or less degree of all texts transmitted to us by the hands of copyists of the itacistic period. We must, therefore, not be misled when our manuscripts appear to preserve ancient forms which are really itacistic, *e. g.* *ἀμείξας* in the Papyrus fragment of Ω. I give here a summary of the oldest MSS of Homer with respect to itacistic forms:

1. In the Papyrus fragment of Ω, first century B. C., itacism is not restricted to so few instances as is the case of other old MSS, but runs through the entire MS.

2. Papyrus frag. of Σ, the youngest of the papyri, has no itacistic examples of the confusion of *ει* and *ī*.

3. Papyrus frag. of Ν, the oldest of this class of MSS, has no instance of itacism.

4. Ambrosianus pictus saec. V-VI, 11 instances of *ει-ī*.

5. Syriac palimpsest saec. VI-VII, 17 instances.

6. Venetus A, saec. X, is remarkably pure.

Finally, in the Codex Etonensis, Townleianus, Vindobonensis No. 5, Cantabrigiensis CCC, all younger manuscripts, itacism is very frequent.

Judging from the testimony afforded by epigraphy (and this is the only certain testimony free from the contamination of tradition),

the first instance of Attic¹ itacism is earlier than 300 B. C., the next about 285, and about 100 B. C. itacism is general. In other parts of Hellas the itacistic orthography prevails from the end of the third century. I except, of course, the dialect of the Boeotians, which first indicates graphically the change that was destined to undermine the individuality of a great part of Greek vocalization. From the relation of sound and writing in Boeotia, which is undoubtedly closer than that prevalent elsewhere, we have a good criterion of the pronunciation of particular sounds which is often lacking in other dialects. From the third century on the tendency to itacism obtains with increasing rapidity. For example, in Kaibel's "Epi-grammata Graeca ex lapidibus conlecta," τ stands for ε 166 times in 113 inscr., ει for τ 420 times in 280 inscr., ει for τ 20 times. No distinction is here made between the genuine and spurious diphthong. ει was originally written for τ alone, but we find that ει stands for τ sporadically after 50 A. D., but after 150 it is quite frequent. In the second century A. D. the distinction between ει and ι had become a "crux orthographica," and even before the birth of Christ it was well-nigh impossible. (Cf. Blass, "Aussprache des Griechischen," 2d edition.) If then this uncertainty existed at the time of the writing of the Papyrus fragment of Ω, are we justified in assuming that our text of Homer (which resembles that of the *κοιναὶ ἐκδόσεις* issued after the edition of Aristarchus, though there were editions bearing this name before his time) is a trustworthy authority even for the pronunciation of the period of the Alexandrian διορθωτής? The Papyrus fragment of N dates presumably from the time of Aristarchus, and it is free from itacism; yet I hold that to conclude, in the face of the testimony of the inscriptions, that Aristarchus himself was not liable to error in his attempt to restore a text which should represent those current before the archonship of Euclides, is highly improbable. Assuming that itacism existed in Greece at the time of the recension of Pisis-tratus, what proof have we that the Alexandrians had any knowledge of texts in vogue at that date? It is maintained that Aristarchus collated² the editions of Massilia, Chios, Sinope, Argos, Cyprus, Crete, and that of the poet Antimachus (floruit circa 400), whose *ἐκδόσις* is said to have been based upon several of above mentioned

¹ Cf. Meisterhans, "Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften," Berlin, 1885, and the review by O. Riemann, "Revue de Philologie," 1885.

² La Roche, Homerische Textkritik, p. 21, "von A. ist es selbstverständlich, dass er sie selbst verglichen habe."

editions. If one reads the evidence adduced by La Roche in support of his statement, it will be clear that the case is not only not proven, but that it is involved in great obscurity. It is the opinion of many scholars, such as Giese and Wackernagel,¹ that neither Aristarchus nor any of the Alexandrians had any MS authority antedating B. C. 403, when the Ionian alphabet was adopted in Athens. Though Aristarchus had texts before him more authoritative than those in the hands of Plato, Xenophon, Aristotle, Aeschines, etc., which must have been free from itacism, yet, as our vulgata is the vulgata of the first centuries after Christ, we cannot be certain either of Aristarchus' own transcription of the old diphthongal sounds or *a fortiori* whether or not our tradition represents the true reading of the fifth or earlier centuries. We must, therefore, in any given case of Homeric τ, later ει, be in doubt as to whether we have to do with a genuine instance of the weakening of ει to τ dating back to the time of Homer, or whether we are dealing with a case of itacism of a later age.

Furthermore, the testimony of the grammarians, scholiasts and lexicographers is invalidated from the fact that the changed pronunciation affected their statements as to orthography, and from the fact that the latest of them at least spoke according to quantity, disregarding the length of the unaccented syllables. The diversity of testimony may be illustrated as follows: Herodian says that in the adverbs ει is written after θ, λ, μ, ξ, ρ, φ, χ, ψ; the Anecd. Ox. is at variance with this law; Herodian, whose especial endeavor it was to preserve the old forms, prescribes -τι; Choeroboscus, however, writes -τει. Nor is the remark unfrequent: "this is written with ει, others say with τ."² And instances like the following are common: εἰράων, Σ 531; Schol. B, *ἰράων*; Hesych. *ἰράων*. In the course of the following investigation the testimony of the grammarians will be occasionally introduced, though from the foregoing it will be clear that no absolute fidelity to the antique forms is to be expected from them.

It is now my purpose to give a list of all words which I have been able to collect (many being entirely new) as supposed instances of the monophthongization of ει in Homer; the result of this investigation, which, in view of the difficulties mentioned, must be more or less tentative, will be stated at the conclusion. In Homeric

¹Such is also the view of Sayce, as I learn from a recent communication.

²La Roche's HTK affords a good survey of the inconsistencies of the grammarians, e. g. pp. 184, 345, 259, 260.

times no such confusion existed between the genuine and the spurious *ει*, as is an established fact for the latter part of the fifth and for the succeeding centuries. Nor is there any confusion in Homer between genuine or spurious *ει* and genuine or spurious *η*. The supposed monophthongization of *ει* refers to that *ει* which, in almost all cases, is a genuine diphthong.

ADVERBS IN *ει*, *ι*.

I. Forms in Homer.

These have been inadequately treated by Dünzter, K. Z. 16, and by Kiessling, K. Z. 17; the explanation of the vowel-coloring by the latter is antiquated and neither treatise can be regarded as possessing intrinsic value. The diphthong is here genuine, being equal *ε* + locative ending *ι*. The *ε* stands in close relation to *ο* (*ἀριθμός*, *ἀριθμέγω*).

A.

ἀσπονδή. *ει θ* 512 CD, *ο 476 x 304* in many MSS, not *ἀσπονδῆ* as composita with *ἀ-* priv. have *ει* or *ι*. The ultimate syllable has the ictus. Reasons for noting the position of the ending in the verse will be given later.

τριστοιχί K 473 6 MSS have *ει*. Ictus. Hesiod Theog. 127 -*ει*. *μεταστοιχί* Ψ 377 C *ει*, Ψ 757 A has *ι*, 7 MSS *ει*. Ictus.

ἀντονυχί Θ 197 *ι* A, *ει* CD. The stem may be a vowel, cf. *πάννυχον*, *νυχεία*; if consonantal (cf. *temperi vesperi*) the *ι* has suffered lengthening sub ictu. *ἀντονυκτί* is late. Herodian -*ει* II 464, -*i* I 505, 512, II 464.

ἀθεεί.

αιεί EI CIA 59, 33; 79, 9; 469. Roehl 375 Chalcidice; 321, 4 Locris; 314 Phocis; 30 Argos. *αιέν* is not supported by Thessalian *αιν*, and, though it occurs only on metrical inscriptions (CIG 284, cf. 3806, 4158, 4633, 4700, 4943), is probably to be removed from the text of Homer. J. Schmidt, K. Z. XXV 24, XXVII 306, explains *αιεί* = *αιεσί* from **aios* = *āyus*, weak stem to the strong stem *aiFós-* in **aiFóσta* = *aiώ*. *āyus* causes Pott difficulty, as he expects **aiεFί* (**āστεFί*) and not the Cyprian form *aiFεi*. But as this word shows in the oldest times a variety of stem-formation (Lat. *aevum*, Goth. *aiveins* adj.; *aiώ* in Homer is from analogy to the *v*-stems), I do not regard it improbable that *aiFεi* has taken its origin from an *ε/o* stem. This view is strengthened by the fact

that in case Schmidt's explanation were correct we should have to read *aīfēi* in the text of Homer (which the metre forbids), according to the law that when σ disappears between the vowels $\epsilon + i$, diaeresis is required except in the case of such words as either form or contain a procelesmaticus (*τελειος ἀφνειστατος*).¹

Schmidt, K. Z. XXVII 299, sees in Thessal. *āiv* as in Lesbic at the neuter-accus. of an *i* stem, and adduces as an argument against the weakening to *i* the fact that the Thessal. dialect possesses no $\nu \acute{\epsilon}\phi\acute{e}lκυστικόν$. The inscription from Larissa, Collitz, Dialekt Inschriften, No. 345 (l. 29, 32, 33, 38, etc.) invalidates his statement. The ν in question is the same as in *πέρυσιν*, etc., cf. Meister 195, and *aītv* on the recently discovered Gortyn inscription. I find foll. instances of *i* for *ei*: Aiolic CDI 304, 35, 37 (319 B. C.); 238, 12 (180 A. D.) (*aēi* 319, 5 before 167 B. C.) cf. Sappho's (96) *āīpārθēvōs* according to Cramer (Anecd. Paris. III 321, 22). *āīsītōi* CIA II 329, 41 third century B. C.; Boeot. *īi* CDI 429, 7. In Homer the *ei* is always preserved intact.

The rejection of Schmidt's assumption of an *-es* stem for *aīfēi* does not lead me to assert that an *-i* stem may not have existed in Greek parallel to the *ε/o* stem, nor that this is not found in Thessalian *āiv*² accus. masc. and fem., Lesbic *aī* neuter accus.³ The plastic nature of this word as regards its stem formation, makes it not unlikely that we shall have to separate certain *āi-* forms from others with *aī* as in Attic *āīsītōi* where *i* is itacistic for *ei*. *aīsī*, the form in the Cretan and Laconian, *aīsī* in the Heraclean dialect have not lost the locative case-sign *i*, which is rarely expelled as a final sound; these forms are neuter accusatives, as *σῆtēs*, *χθēs*, to **alos* = I. E. *āivas* = Skt. *āyus*. Cf. also *aītoetēs* *aītoetēi*, *aītoθēs* *aītoθēlei*.

B. Ending -τη, mostly with a- av- privative.

ἀμογητὶ ἀειρεν Δ 637 proves nothing as to the original quantity.—
ἀμαχητὶ at end of hexam. Φ 437.—ἀναιμωτὶ v. l. *ei* only ω 532 and Ρ 363. Ictus.—ἀνοντητὶ X 371. Ictus.—ἀνιδωτὶ Ο 228. Ictus.—
ἐγρηγορτὶ Κ 182. Ictus.—ēkητὶ dēkētὶ form the only exceptions to the original oxytone accentuation of these adverbs.

¹ Cf. my treatise "On the diphthong EI," page 42. *aīfēi* would be a unique exception to the above law, which should perhaps be modified by adding that in the case of certain *-iη* formations *-eīη* may have become *-iη*.

² The Thessalian dialect does not reduce *ei* to *i*. Meister, I 298.

³ Lesbic offers no trace of an $\nu \acute{\epsilon}\phi\acute{e}lκυστικόν$ in the inscriptions before the Roman period, cf. Fick, Odyssee 32, and Leipziger Studien, 1881, Vol. IV.

C. Ending *-στι*.

ἀνωστί δ 92. Ictus.—*μεγαλωστέ*.—δια- μελεῖστι.

Our MSS authority (with the exception of A) in the case of adverbs that show a consonant, except τ, before the locative case-sign, permit the form ει. In the case of -τι the long vowel predominates, assuming that it has not been lengthened pro tempore by the ictus. Only ἀ- ἔκητι and two in -στι show τ.

II. Evidence afforded by Inscriptions.

νηποιεί Amphipolis Cauer² 551, 10 about 350 B. C.

ἀσπονδεί Aiolic GDI 315; *ἀσπονδί* 312, 11 which increases the probability that the ι is long in the two Aiolic forms cited below. CIG 2354 Ceos.—καὶ *ἀσυλεί* 2053b Thrace; *ἀσπονδεί* 2056 Thrace; 2256 Samos; 2264 Amorgos; 2675-78 Caria.

ἀνθημερεί CIA II 471, 71 first century B. C. is uncertain.

ἀκοντεί R. 380 Thasos. Herodian wrote -ι.

ἀνατεί CIG 104.

ἀσυλεί CIA I 41, 13 fifth cent.

πανδάμι Lesbian, Cauer² 430 B, 3.

ἀσυλί Bechtel, Aeolische Insch. Bezz. Beit. V 61, 10 in Roman characters. The formula *ἀσυλί καὶ ἀσπονδί* C²170 Telos. Cf. CIG 2053. αὐ, etc., have been otherwise explained. *άισιτοι* Attic, may, however, be referred to this class.

όνομαστί CIA I 40, 44 (424 B. C.)

(The Doric forms *διπλεῖ*, *τουτεῖ*, *τηνεῖ*, *αύτεῖ*, etc., never suffer reduction. The deictic τ in *ούτοστ*, etc., is Skt. i old Bactr. i or it and not from ει.)

III. Evidence afforded by Later Literature.

(The earliest author is cited for each case.) In comparison with Homer the later literature shows that these adverbs are on the increase.

A. Vowel-stems with -ει as adverbial ending: *πανδημεί* Aesch.—*πανομλεί* Aesch.—*αὐτοβοεί* Thuc., Herodian II 464.—*ἀμοθεί* Thuc.—*ἀμαχεί* Thuc., *αὐτομαχεί* Dio Cass.—*παμψηφεί* Cratinus.—*πανοικεί* Plato, *οἰκεί* Menander, with regression of the accent. *οἴκει* has no immediate connection with *οἴκοι* as has been frequently maintained. *οἴκει*

¹ Collitz, "Griechische Dialekt-Inschriften."

—*veçé*.—*aîroȳei* Grammarians, Et. Gud. Isidorus; traces of *-i* are rare.—*âbouλεi*, *ânaulεi* Suid.—*âðμoλεi* Suid.—*âθroεi* Philes.

B. Vowel-stems with *-i* as adverbial ending: *âμoσθi* Archilochus, cf. Herodian I 505, 11.—*âμoχθi* Aesch., Herodian I 505 *-εi*.—*πaνoνdī* Thuc. v. l. *-εi*. *πaσoνdī* Xen.—*νaωnμi* Eurip. v. l. *-εi*.—*âμoρi* Aristoph.—*πaνoκi* Plato. Phrynicus says that the form with *-εi* was common with the Athenians.—*πaνðaμt* Anthologia Pal. V 44.—*ēνðoμuχi* Hesychius.—*πaνoρμi* Hesychius.—*âθrηνi*, *âκuδuνi*, *âμeρi* Suidas.—*âπoινi* Agathias.—*âκlαγγi* Longus.—*âνaωnμet* and *-i* Et. Mag.—*âπaτaγi* Suidas.—*âκrονvχt* A. P. 12, from a vowel-stem probably.—*ēγkυt* Archilochus, *i*-stem, cf. cutis. But *aνoλeξεi* Clem. Alex., Herodian II 464, and *aîroȳei* Gram.

C. Ending *-τi* *-τei* from verbal adjective in *-τoς*:

1. *τ* appears in *âvari* Aesch.—*âσtakt* Soph.—*âνoμoκt* Soph.

2. The short *i* in the following words may be either from *τ* or transferred from the *τ* of consonant-stems. Besides the *-es*-stems mentioned below I have found 8 other examples of *i* from stems ending in a consonant: *âβoari* Pind.—*ēγkυnηt* Pind. no verb. adj. in *-τoς*.—*ēγepti* Soph.—*âσtakt* Soph.

3. Quantity is doubtful in *âπoηtηt* Hdt.—*âκoνtηt* Thuc. (L. and S. *τ*), no verb. adj. in *-τoς*.—*âνaωmοt* Hdt.—*âνtopobηt* Luc.—*âðakrυt* Isocr.—*âκpιt* Lys.

4. *-τei* in *âκpυktet* or *-i* Thuc., *-εi* Herodian.—*âklauσtei* or *-i* Callim. (*τ* Draco, 37, 96.)—*âκpυtεi* or *-i* Joseph.—*âνtoparei* or *-i* Nonnus.—*âνtoeutet* Dio Cass.—*âνoηtεi* Herodian.

-σtι is always short in the post-Homeric poets, though we find that Herodian (II 464) writes *âπleuσtεi* *âγeλaσtεi*, the *εi* of which stands probably for *τ*, as occurs after 50 A. D.

D. Stems in *-es*. *âtpeμi* Aristoph. Ravenn.; Boisson. Anecd. *-εi*—*ηpεμi* Aristoph. Ravenn.; Boisson. Anecd. *-εi* recte accord. to Dindorf, Stephan. Thesaurus s. v.—*âμeλεi* Xen.—*âνtoeεt* Theocr., Bergk *âνtoeεt* from *ēνos*.—*πaνeθεi* Strabo.—*πaμplηθεi* Dio Cass.—*πaγγeεt* Xanthus.—*âνtobεt* Anthol. Pal.—*âβlaθi* Choerob. (*βλάβos* or *βλάθη*).—*âtpebi* Pollux (*âtpebi* or *τpibή*).—*âκraεi*, cf. Steph. Thesaur. s. v. *âκraj̄s*.

In reconstructing the pre-Pisistratic text of Homer that method is gradually meeting with favor, which, basing its conclusions on the results obtained from a collection of the oldest forms found either in literature or in inscriptions, establishes as Homeric the oldest demonstrable Greek (not Graeco-Italic or proethnic) form. Such is more or less the procedure of Christ, and which met no

little opposition at the hands of Curtius. Nauck's position is peculiar. He at one time adopts correct ancient forms, at another follows the MSS in preferring impossibilities. The statement of the correctness of the method named above does not assume that in each individual instance the Homeric form is necessarily the most ancient.

As regards the special point under discussion the argument is an *a fortiori* one. If the material, here for the first time collected, does not prove that all Homeric adverbs in *-i* (excepting those in *-ri*) from vowel-stems should be written with *-ei* as the oldest form, it at least places the *onus probandi* upon the shoulders of those who maintain the contrary. Of the adverbs from the authors of the fifth century that show *-i*, at least half have *-ei* as a *varia lectio*, while fifty, if not seventy-five per cent., of all the forms adduced show the older form. Epigraphic testimony is apodictical proof that in at least two-thirds of the endings *ει* was the accepted orthography. Upon what unstable ground do they then stand who maintain that the reduction had taken place in the epic period, that in the fifth century the old form was regenerated to yield in turn to *-i* of the latest grammarians?

In the case of adverbs derived from *-τος*, the reduction from *-τει* to *-τι* has in all probability taken place at the time of the writing down of the Homeric poems, despite the fact that the MSS offer two cases of *-τει*. The coincidence that *-τι* occurs only sub ictu remains a coincidence merely. The fact that *-τι* is short in a few cases even in Homer; that in the literature of the fifth century we find but one case of *-τει*, and that with the v. l. *τι*, renders more conclusive the argument that *-τι* was felt as an ending at an early period, as in *ἐκητι*, where there is no corresp. *-τος*. Were it not for the existence of the intermediate *-τι*, the form *-τι* might be explained by the accent shifting, which may have been the genesis of many adverbs in *τ*. It need not surprise us that in one class of adverbs we find the reduction to *i* an accomplished fact, while in another the old diphthong has been preserved. Phonetic laws do not affect all members of a system "at the stroke of twelve," as Curtius was wont to remark. The suggestion should, however, not be suppressed that it is possible that *-τι* - *στι* in Homer has the *-τ* of consonant-stems transferred to those stems which end in a vowel. If we should adopt this explanation it would remove even this instance of the reduction, but the ease of an explanation by analogy is oftentimes dangerous to its probability, and a more

conservative and more defensible standpoint is the one maintained above. The *causa movens* of the monophthongization remains veiled in obscurity; and the simple statement that a desire to relieve the heaviness of the syllable made itself felt fails to exhaust the question.

If, however, in the case of -τ parallel to -ει we admit the existence of the former form in Homer, it is not to be explained as the result of the assimilation of the elements of the genuine diphthong of the case-ending, whatever may be its origin in later times. That in a few isolated cases in the later, and generally in the latest literature the -τ may have arisen from ει I will not deny. But that the transformation had taken place in the eighth century B. C. I cannot believe, and for those who shrink from accepting the authority of the inscriptions, poets and historians of the fifth century to such an extent as to correct the text of Homer in the few cases where -τ appears (excepting -τι) I will offer another argument based on the origin of the forms themselves. It may be prefaced that two principles appear to be active in the oldest stages of the Indo-European languages :

1. If a preposition, adverb or adjective is united with a substantive to form an adjective, no suffix is necessary.

2. The "secondary suffix *ya*" (to use the common nomenclature, though in reality I doubt the existence of a factor "*ya*" in the formation of this class)¹ is employed if from a substantive (-a-stem) an adjective is to be derived.

Mahlow ("Die langen Vocale A E O," p. 121) makes the observation that in the case of (1) the -a-stems become -i-stems. To be sure we find a few uncompounded -i-stems existing parallel to the -a-stems (*gōka* RV. later *goci* AV.), therefore forms like *bhadragoci* RV. are of less value as examples; nevertheless there are a large number of cases where the -i-stem is first found in composition. In Slavic (*sugubī sugubū*), Keltic (*sutain suthin* from *tan*), Gothic (*ganuogi ganohs*), and in Latin this phenomenon is observed. In Latin there prevails an increasing tendency to transform other stems into -i-stems, which has even led to the difficulty in distinguishing the consonantal from the -i-declension. What is there parallel to this in Greek? The Greeks seem to have been disinclined to infuse into their language these -i-stems, a large number of which they do not possess in the substantive

¹ *ya*-stems are really from the locative *i* + a paragogic element *a*, *o*, etc. ἀέρι-ο-ς
Δακεδαιμόνι-ο-ς ἄφ(ε)νει-ό-ς, etc.

inflection. On the contrary there is constantly present a tendency to adopt the “-ya-stems” (*πάννυχος πανύχιος*, both in Homer). Cannot these “-ya-stems” have driven out the old adjective -i-stem declension? That it must have once existed we cannot doubt, therefore it may not be unlikely that in *πανδημί* we have the neuter nominative, in *πανδημεῖ*¹ the locative of such an -i-stem, which has been supplanted by *πανδήμος*. Adverbs in -i or -ei are not formed from simple uncompounded adjectives. *πάνδημος: sublimus: πανδημί (-ei): sublimis* is the ratio which Mahlow assumes. The fact must not, however, be suppressed that there are difficulties in the way of this explanation, one of which I will briefly mention. If *πανδημί* be the neuter nom. (or accus.) of an adjective -i-stem, the ultimate syllable should be short so far as Greek is concerned. Can the neuter suffix *a* = Skt. *i* have been dropped, leaving the stem either in the pure short form or with the lengthened stem-vowel? For the u-stems we have Skt. *puru* and *puru*, but in Greek no such example, since that adduced by Mahlow is incorrect (*γλάφν* not *γλάφν* Hesiod. Op. 533). For the -i-stems we can discover no case of the long vowel. *ὅρνις, ἐνκνήμις, μέρμις* are = Skt. feminines in -is² and therefore do not belong here.

It is alien to the purpose of this paper to enter into a discussion of the origin of the locative adverb in Indo-European. My purpose in making mention of this theory was this: to show that the monophthongization of *eu* in these adverbs is undemonstrable, and that there is at least a choice between two explanations to account for the existence of -τ- parallel to -ei in the text of Homer; either that -τ had crept into the text at the hands of the writers of our manuscripts, or that its existence, together with that of *eu*, is morphologically justifiable. Both explanations cannot of course be correct, but to suppress either the one or the other attempt at elucidation would be to lessen the balance of probability against the assumed monophthongization.

¹ Brugmann in his Griech. Gramm.² calls *πανδημεῖ* “probably” a locative. Pott in B. B. VIII 39 suggests that the -i of these case-adverbs is comparable to the deictic *i* of *viví*, etc. He gives, however, no reasons for his conjecture. The locative readily lends itself to such adverbial use. For Sanskrit cf. Whitney, §1116.

² Lanman, “Noun inflection, p. 366. Brugmann’s (Gr. Gramm.) assumption of a form *πόλτης* on account of *πολτηγ* is without foundation, since -τηγ appears as a pure ending (resulting from contraction?) no matter whether the substantive was an -i-stem or not. Cf. *δότηγ*, etc.

SUPPOSED INSTANCES OF THE DATIVE-ENDING -ει,
APPEARING AS ī IN HOMER.

Hartel, Hom. Stud. I² 56 seqq., has sought to prove the existence of the old dative-ending ει in the form ī. G. Meyer (Gram. §345) calls this explanation a probable one. The ī occurs in sixteen words in Homer, in each case the -ει being in arsi.

A. The ictus rests upon ī, which is followed by a single consonant: Ὀδυσσῆι 7 times, Ἀχιλλῆι 5, σθένει 5, σάκει 3, ὑπερμένει 3, Αἴαντι 3, πτόλει 2, πατέρι 2, κράτει 1, Αἰδι 1, λίθακι 1, κόρυθι 1, νηὶ 1.

B. The ictus rests upon ī, which is foll. by a double consonant: σθένεῖ 8, Ἀχιλλῆι 3, Ὀδυσσῆι 2, κόρυθι 2.

C. The ictus rests upon ī, which is foll. by a muta cum liq.: Αἰδι 6, ὑπερμένει 4, Ἀχιλλῆι 3, κράτει 2, σάκει 1, πατέρι 1.

D. The ictus rests upon ī, which is foll. by a vowel: ἔτει 6, Ἡρακλέει 1, Ὀδυσσῆι 1, σάκει 1.

The curious forms Διειτρέψης (CIA 402; 447, 53, Wecklein, Curae Epig. 39, Herwerden, Lapidum de dialecto Attica testimonia, Meisterhans, Grammatik der attischen Inschriften, 1885, p. 25). Διειθεμις Cyprian CDI 61, 21 (Διειθεμις 74 is unexplainable), δ 477 διειπερέος Zenodotus, Zenodorus,¹ seem to offer some support to Hartel's theory. Yet the entire absence of any similar instances renders the existence of an archaic dative in this group of the highest improbability. διει- is == Skt. *divi-*, which does not appear as a part of compounds (cf. *divi-*, *diva-*, *divas-*). Were εὐδιέστερος, -τατος not young, and therefore analogical forms, I would assume a stem διει-; Διειθεμις would be then similar to the many locative-compounds of Skt.²

It is *a priori* improbable that this ī is a remnant of the old dative case-ending, for, granted the amalgamation of dative and locative in Greek, these 16 cases are the only instances of the final long vowel. To conjecture with Brugmann (Gramm. §82), that the analogy of πόλιται may have caused the lengthened ultima is to confess oneself afflicted with the "Kinderkrankheit der Analogie"; more probable is his other conjecture, to escape from the assumption of metrical lengthening, which he is however here not disinclined to adopt, namely, that the ī is "a proethnic parallel form to Vedic ī in

¹ Choeroboscus cites διηπετής, which must be an incorrect transcription. διφίλος never with ει as v. l.

² So Roediger, De priorum membrorum in nominibus graecis compositis conformatioне finali, p. 49.

the locative. *tanū(v)-i tanū(v)-i, vaktár-i* and *vaktár-i*. Whitney, §355, 357, says that *tanvī* occurs "in a passage or two," §371 "the *i* of the locative-singular is lengthened in a few words: *kartári*." Though many of these infrequent forms are very ancient (cf. the locative in Skt. without *i* and such words as *oikoyenīs*, where *oiko-* serves as *oīkoi*, cf. Πυλόνιγενīs), the uncertainty as yet attendant upon such forms is too great to allow definite combinations. In the Veda *a, i, u* are found in the lengthened form even when the metre opposes the change; the probability is that in time all such phenomena will be explained morphologically. It is commonly held that proof of the ictus-influence is seen in the reduplication of the following consonant. Whether any account is to be taken of a singular form hitherto unnoted, *'Apáθθοιο*, where the consonant seems to be doubled even in thesi (cf. *'Apátha' Apáthηs* in later writers), I am doubtful. The form occurs on the famous Arniadas' inscription of Corcyra (Cauer² 84), which is of extreme antiquity and contains unmistakable imitations of the epic dialect. Does this *'Apáθθοιο* belong to the class of words like *ἐνμμεγάροισι*, as Aristophanes of Byzantium wrote? The θθ most probably is for τθ. It would seem that comparative philologists would welcome any attempt to stigmatize the metri licentia theory as savoring of antiquatedness, yet Fick, who may be classed among those who are in general conservative enough, and Brugmann have accepted this explanation here, though the latter does not fail to put forward other possible but improbable explanations. Hartel's theory of Homeric versification has met with favor in many quarters. In opposition to Curtius he denies with justice that a few forms which have lost an initial sound should have been the cause of metrical lengthening before others which lost no initial consonant. He maintains on the other hand, that the lengthening of short syllables before words beginning with λ, μ, ν, ρ, δ, Φ is caused in a minority of cases by the assumption of the loss of an initial sound, which is indisputably correct, but in a majority of instances the cause of the lengthening consists in the nature of these six sounds, which once possessed a greater phonetic body, and in the delicacy of the Greek ear, which had the power of recognizing as long a short vowel before a sonant. This increased body of sound inherent in the above-mentioned sounds must, however, even in the Homeric period, have suffered attenuation, since but very few stems offer any proof of this assumption, and, furthermore, there are constant variations in the case of these very stems. Lastly, Hartel must

grant that this thickened body of sound is preserved only under the protection of the arsis. Some instances he explains morphologically, while for others ($\delta\epsilon\tau\acute{o}\nu$) he finds no solution. It is not my purpose to discuss further a question concerning which there will never cease to be a contest between the schools. A renewed and more careful investigation of the whole subject in the light of recent views concerning the origin of the Homeric poems may, I believe, lead to a delimitation of the domain claimed almost exclusively by each and all of the contending theories. For the present at least I hold it to be premature to deny the possibility of lengthening by metrical necessity, and I prefer to place here the above dative-locative forms. In any case, and on this stress must be laid, there is no reason to adopt the view which makes τ arise from ϵ . The standpoint assumed here is that the ictus-theory is not to be adopted until all other probable, not merely possible, explanations have been brought forward. In the case of - $\tau\acute{i}$ I preferred to assume the existence of a monophthongized diphthong rather than accept the metrical lengthening of - $\tau\acute{i}$.

EI, ī, ī IN SUFFIX-SYLLABLES IN HOMER.

I limit myself here to $-e\bar{\imath}\eta$ $-\bar{e}\eta$. For $-eia$ $-ia$ in general see Fick, Bezzemb. Beitr. I.

A. ει.—(1) ἀναλκείη P 320, 337 v. l. ι. Nauck ι.—μαντείη Hymn. Roehl IGA 113, b, 7. Add.—αιδρείη v. l. ι.—πολυιδρείη v. l. ι.—ἀγελείη.—τηρείη.

B. τ.—(1) in arsi : ἀνίη Odyss. μ 223, Apoll. ει, Hsd. Theog. 611 ; first traces of τ in Sappho and Theognis, later τ.—καλίη, τ Theocr. —κορίη, λ 600 Φ 271 τ.

(2) in thesi: ἀεργίη ω 251 ει, so Bion VI 2.—ἀτιμίη Attic τ.—ἀκομιστίη.—ιστή τ Hymn XXIV, nom. prop. ἐστή Hsd. Attic.—κακοεργίη v. l. ει χ 374.—προθυμίη.—ὑπεροπλίη. Several of the Etymologica ει.—ὑποδεξίη. ει in Ven. A.—Ὑπερησίη. Many MSS ει B 573, ο 254. Apoll. Rh. ‘Ὑπεράστος.—ἀνολβίη Hsd.—ἀπιστή Hsd.

C. τ (vowel and -ει-stems).—ἀβλαβίη.—ἀγγελίη.—ἀγλαΐη.—ἀεικεῖη - ίν Apoll., Soph., Eusthatius. Attic *iη* Jebb ad Elect. 486.—Αἰολίη — ἀλαστοκοπίη.—ἀληθεῖη.—ἀματροχίη.—ἀμηχανίη.—ἀμμορίη.—ἀρματροχίη.—ἀρμονίη.—Ἀρτακιή.—Ἀσκανίη.—ἀταλασθίη.—ἀντοσταδίη.—ἀντοσχεδίη.—ἀφραδίη.—ἀχυρωμάτη.—βουκολίη Hymn.—Δαρδανίη.—δεξιή.—έγχειη.—ένηειη.—ἐντροπίη Hymn.—ἐπεισβολίη.—ἐνδικίη.—ἐνυνομίη.—ἐνύκλειη.—ἐσχατιή.—ξεφυρίε.—ἡλικίη.—Ἡμαθίη.—ἥσυχίη.—Θαλίη.—κατηφεῖη Γ 51

v. l. *ἰη*.—κερτομίη.—λαμπετίη.—λοφιή.—Δυκίη.—μειλιχίη.—μαρτυρίη.—ματίη.—μελίη.—ναυτιλίη.—νηνεμίη.—νοτίη.—νωχελίη.—όμηλικίη.—οίκωφελίη.—δσίη.—Οὐρανίη Ήymn.—Πιερίη.—παρηορίη.—πλανοδίη Ήymn.—πολυκερδεῖη, v. l. ω 167 -ίη, cf. ψ 77 v. l.—πολυκουρανίη.—πολυμηχανίη.—πρυμωρεῖη.—πρασίη.—πυγμαχίη.—σκοπίη.—σοφίη.—στρατίη.—σχεδίη.—Σχερίη.—ύπερτερίη. 67 in all, and 16 in -σίη apparently from nouns in -σις, most of which are not extant.

Of the examples cited, 14 (Iliad 4, Iliad and Od. 1, Odyssey 6, Hesiod 3) have -ίη. Of these 3 have τ in arsi,¹ 11 in thesi. It is therefore impossible from this ratio alone that the stress of tone can have produced the lengthening. That a vowel in thesi can be lengthened metri licentia is false, though the theory has been adopted by Stephanus, Buttmann, Spitzner and Hentze.² Hartel and G. Meyer take refuge in the deus ex machina jod, to the appearance of which in Cyprian many have rendered their tribute of gratitude. It is absolutely undemonstrable that this sound, which disappeared even in Homer's time (*τρεῖς*), ever possessed in Homer or in any other Greek author the power to lengthen a preceding vowel. The only possible explanation is that the *ι*<*ει* was originally long and was subsequently weakened before a following vowel (cf. ἥτια λέτην). That this change can occur has been proved by L. Meyer (Bezzb. Beit. 1878) and reasserted by Kobilinski (De AΙY vocalium apud Hom. mensura, 1882). Thus *ἀτιμει-η ἀτιμίη (the form *τιμεία* is found CIG 214, 26, *τιμία* 12, 21, 320 B. C.). τ in thesi is not confined to Homer or Hesiod, but appears in προεδρίη τυρανίη Xenophanes, πολυιθρίη, καχεταιρίη, ἀπιστίη Theognis, in the first two of which Bergk writes -είη.

The -ει-stems offer instances of ιη. In the case of several, it is uncertain whether as a matter of fact we have to do with -ει- or with -α-stems.³

It is not surprising that we find -ίη for -είη in Homer, as some early inscriptions record the change. Between -εια and -ια, which latter was held by the grammarians to be ποιητικώτερον, a change of quantity doubtless furthered the inherent tendency to diphthongal simplification, but in the case of these substantives in Homer the

¹ κονίη 6 times in arsi has the long ι of the Aiolic κονίω, cf. ἀδικήω πεινᾶω.

² La Roche defends the form πολυκερδίη as an analogy to the τ forms in thesi.

³ Bezzemberger (IV 325) is also uncertain in reference to the form of the stem of many of these words. If κακοεργή, ἀφραδίη are really -ει-stems it is possible that the stem of ἀνίη may be ἀνεο-; cf. Latin *onus*. The doubt as to the form of the stem renders uncertain the additional exception to the law of diaeresis suggested in the note to page 427.

Ionic coloring of the final vowel gave no assistance to the change. It is furthermore incorrect to assert, as some have done, that the forms in -*ētē* were produced metri licentia, because some of the -*eītē* forms would not adapt themselves to the hexameter, e.g. (*oīkōphēlītē*). A further instance of weakening under similar circumstances is that of -*eīas* to -*tās* -*taś* in proper names. For examples see G. Meyer (Bezz. Beitr. I 90). Τλαστί_{ta}^{fo}, Cauer² No. 83, and Δεινί_{ta}^{fa} Cauer² No. 71 are cited as the only cases of τ: "Αμφτος is to be ranked with Αμφίων and others in -*tw*."

NOUNS, ADJECTIVES WITH ī FOR WHICH EI IS FOUND IN INSCRIPTIONS OR IN THE LATER LITERATURE.

λίκνον. Hymn. Merc. 21. Hesychius has the foll. glosses: νεικητήρ· λικμητήρ. Μεγαρεῖς; νείκλον· τὸ λίκνον. Herodian, II 543 quotes the form with *ei* as being the proper orthography. If these forms are not itacistic they prove the antiquity of the diphthong, which we should expect from its connection with Lith. *nēkōti*.

ἢτα < ἀϝεσja *ἥεια, Skt. *avasdm* or to *sasydm*? A word of very doubtful explanation. That the τ is under the ictus three times has certainly nothing to do with the quantity, nor is the explanation of τ = *ij* tenable. If τα is from εια < εσja it would be the only example in Homer of εια from εσja. -*eīos* in Homer if the sibilant has been expelled. (Exceptions, page 427.)

The τ of χίλιοι is the Hellenistic form and does not properly belong in Homer (χίλια). In later Aiolic inscriptions we find χιλ- e.g. 332 B. C., but older Aiolic χάλλιοι, Doric χῆλλιοι only once, CIG 1511; Boeot., Ion. χείλιοι prove that the i is itacistic. There is no trace of a parallel form *χίλλιοι (as in the case of Ἰληθι ἔλλαθι ✓ σελF σιλF), the reduction of which would give χίλιοι. The common Attic χίλιοι is a witness to the same itacism, and it is to its influence that we owe the existence in Homer of a form dating from a posterior age. The inscription from Chios (Roehl, IGA 381) shows a remarkable variety in the orthography, which must denote the uncertainty in reference to the actual pronunciation which was in the mind of the cutter of the stone, if not of the Chians and others. There are but few examples in old inscriptions where the spurious diphthongal sound is written EI, and though this peculiar orthography is no proof that the word for "a thousand" was even then so much exposed to the itacistic tendency as to necessitate a form like χīλιοι (EIMI, ✓ ει also on inscriptions before 403 B. C.,

was not affected for two centuries), it substantiates my belief that $\chi\acute{\iota}\lambda\iota\omega$ is not a very old form, certainly that the long vowel does not extend to the Homeric age. That the form had a peculiar history is furthermore attested by the common Doric form $\chi\acute{\iota}\lambda\iota\omega$ even in early inscriptions and by Attic $\chi\acute{\iota}\lambda\iota\omega$, for of $\chi\acute{\iota}\lambda\iota\omega$, stated by Meister to be Attic, I have found no trace.

$\nu\eta\lambda\acute{\iota}\tau\eta\varsigma$ Kayser and Hayman π 317, τ 498, χ 418 as if the root syllable of *ἀλείτω ἀλιτένιν ἀλιτέσθαι had suffered itacism. The v. l. show that the MSS are in a state of confusion, but La Roche reads correctly καὶ αἱ νηλείτιδές εἰσιν. Cf. his Hom. Textkritik, where evidence is adduced that Aristarchus wrote νηλείτης.

$\tau\acute{\iota}\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha$ i. e. Εἴτρη. Εἴτρα name of an Attic dème CIA I 273b, cf. also Εἴτραιος, II 334d, 20. Blass, Aussprache² 54, demands as the correct orthography εἴτρη, and I see no reason for refusing to accept this as the Homeric form. Herodian τάτρα. Latin *vitis*, Lettic *witūolis* prove merely the existence of the long vowel for these two languages and fail to account for Εἴτρα. Cf. Herwerden, "Lapidum de dialecto Attica testimonia," and O. Riemann, Revue de Philologie, IX 178.

$\tau\acute{\iota}\lambda\delta\acute{\iota}\nu$ i. e. Φιλαδόν. Herodotus εἴληδόν I 172 v. l. ιλαδόν; cf. I 73 εἴλη v. l. ίλη, Stein. Ιληδόν also εἴληδόν is found in late Greek (Quint. Smyr.) ίλη is the common Attic, εἴλη the Ionic form. εἴλαρχέω CIG I 1576 is Boeotian, therefore ει=τ. Φιλαρχίστων Leake (North. Greece, II 31). βειλαρμοστάι Hesychius is either itacistic or from εἴλω i. e. Φείλω, Dor. Φήλω. Whether ὄμιλος belongs, as Curtius maintains, to this group is not beyond doubt. Lobeck considered -τλος to be a suffix, and this is found in ναυτίλος ὄπτιλος with different accentuation. Hesychius' gloss ίλη· ὄμηλος points to a Doric form from Φήλω. Κ 338 we have the v. l. ὄμιλος; cf. πέδιλον Ω 340 Papyr. frag. of Ω, Ambros., Syr. pālimp. have ει; πέδιλλον in two MSS. Ω 712 v. l. ὄμειλος is itacistic. ὄμιλος is received as an Aiolic form into the text of Sappho by Ahrens (cf. Dial. I 58). If this is a genuine form, which I see no occasion to doubt, the τ is not from the ει of εἴλω, and we must accept the rule that τ+λ in Homer = τλλ in Aiolic = τλ in Attic (*πέδιλον* is a poetic word; Euripides is the only authority quoted for the Attic use). Of the examples cited by Meyer (Gram. §293) πτλος is doubtful, the others are πέδιλον, ἄργιλος (Aristotle) and ἔτιλα, which is *ἔτιλ-σα. The λλ form in this group is found in Homeric ίλλας "rope," though Curtius separates \checkmark Φειλ "wind" from \checkmark Φειλ "press." The genesis of Φείλω Φήλω and ίλλω is involved in uncertainty. Brugmann (Griech.

Gramm.) does not adopt any solution; his attempt (Stud. IV 122) is not satisfactory. The form ἄλω (Aristoph.) causes the greatest difficulty. This I conjecture to be a weak form: *F_ελF=F_ελF* (Lat. *volvo* for **velvo*), from this ἴλη ἴλαδόν. It is possible that as εἴλη and ἴλη existed, so too εἴληδόν and ἴληδόν ἴλαδόν. The weak vowel is often found between *F* and liquids ε-*F*ιρίνη, √*F*ερ, ε-*F*ιρος, ε-*F*ιργω (?) To the root *F*ελ, ἴλ-τς "mud," may be related. Hesychius εἴλυ· μέλαν; ίλύ· πηλός. ὑποστάθμη; ίλύσω· ίλυῖ περικαλύψω. Φ 318-19 contains a play upon the meaning of noun and verb. The adjective may be derived from the strong root-form *F_ελF-*; the noun from *F_ελF-*. In εἴλω the *v* is either a conjugational sign or it is the vocalized *F*; cf. φθίνω i. e. *φθίν*F*ω φθινίθω. Is the latter the case, the ε is prosthetic vowel and ι indicative of the weak root-form (ε-*F*ιλ-ύ-ω). In any case I do not see the necessity of deriving the noun directly from the adjective.

It is doubtful whether κίων "column" belongs to κείω "cut," the ει of which verb presents difficulties. Fick (Bezz. Beitr. I 333) maintains their connection and that of M. H. G. *schie* "hedge-stake." κίων would then stand for *σκείων. κείων occurs on an inscription of the time of Hadrian (CIG 3148), from which we learn nothing as to the original form. A plausible etymology is Armenian *siun* 'column.' *Siun=F_εīvan* or **sēvan* (Hübschmann, Armen. Stud. p. 49). The ι of κίων (*κίFων*) is then proethnic and not from ει.

Fēikelos *Fīkelos*. The latter 17 times, the former has the v. l. ι (which is not to be adopted) N 53, 330, 688, Δ 253, Σ 386, Ρ 88, 281, Σ 154, Υ 423, Χ 134, κ 304, λ 207, τ 384, ν 88, φ 411, χ 240, Hym. VII 21. *Fīkelos* is not from *Fīkelos* < *Fēikelos* as those who demur to the weakening of ει before a consonant would have to maintain, but is from *Fēikelos* by change of accent. That -os was at one time bearer of the accent is proved by such forms as ἀφ(ε)νείός, γεραιός, cf. γῆρας.

σκῆ, Skt. *chāyā*. The Hesychian σκοιά· σκοτεινά and Gothic *skeima* make it probable that σκιά is either from *σκεία through *σκτα, or is the weak form transferred from a weak case as gen. pl. where the accent caused the expulsion of the ε sound. The latter is the more probable supposition.

ἡμῖν ὑμῖν. G. Meyer (Griech. Gramm. §113) assures us that these forms are "certainly" for ἡμεῖν ὑμεῖν, but, §421, he is uncertain whether the -ειν represents the older and more correct orthography. The form in -ειν is met with for the first time 193 B. C. on a Teian

inscription CIG 3045. We find *ημεῖν* CIG 2737, with no other trace of itacism on the inscription. CIA II 547, 17 ἀμίν preserves the common orthography. Here even Meyer becomes doubtful about the correctness of his general method of argumentation: that forms on later inscriptions are authority for words occurring in an author so remote as Homer. For this sanctification of inscription-forms he is properly rebuked by Blass. The variation in the above words only goes to prove that itacism did not affect all forms, even of the same category, at the same time. The genesis of the dative plural of the pronominal declension is involved in such obscurity (Brugmann in his Griech. Gram. offers no theory in reference to -*w*) that it is presumptuous to draw any conclusion from testimony of so late a date.

Πολύτδος. The v. l. with *ει*, E 148, has not so good authority as the vulgata reading (cf. also N 663), though the form *Πολυειδῆς* is found in later Greek (Fick, "Personen-Namen," p. 113). Accepting the reading with the monophthong, the length of the vowel has caused great difficulty. There is no trace of a τ in the root *Fid* in Greek, therefore the comparison of the Avestan *vithushi* does not seem pertinent, nor is the analogy of Lithuanian a cogent argument for the existence of the long root-vowel here, which would be a solitary instance. Hartel would doubtless find in the greater body of sound which he supposed the dental sonant to have once possessed, the cause of the apparent lengthening. There seems, however, to be a physiological difference between μ, ν, ρ, λ and δ. Wackernagel (KZ XXV 261) seeks to explain the τ morphologically. Noticing that in many words when Homer has τ, Attic has ρ, the change is to be ascribed to the influence of F, he sees in -τδος a remnant of the oldest participial form *τδώς Hom., = *FιδFώς, *τδώς Attic.¹ Homer, however, so far from preserving such an archaic form as *τδώς, has ειδώς forty-five times, and even ειδῦνα P 5, which, however, can be emended. Though the objection which has been made to Wackernagel's hypothesis, on account of a supposed Homeric form *Fειδνία*, cannot be supported on any grounds whatsoever, it is evident that his hypothesis is improbable on chronological grounds, even if the -ος be accepted as an "abgestumpfte Endung." All difficulties would be solved by reading -ειδος (Dindorf 4, if we may cite so indifferent a text), but

¹ His comparison of δείδια, Attic δέδια, is incorrect, since the ει of δείδια is a mere graphic expression of the long vowel before δF. Many of his etymologies are venturesome, e. g. *οὐFευπτος.

the reading of La Roche, we must admit, has not as yet been satisfactorily disposed of.

νίκη νικάω. 44 times with EI in Kaibel's "Epigrammata." Hsd. Theog. 247 *Εἰνείκη* in all MSS. E. M. *Εἰνείκα* (cf. Theocritus XIII 45), a scholar of Sappho; cf. Suidass. v. *Σαπφώ*. I regard these forms with *ei* as itacistic. Osthoff (M. U. IV 223) has given a good etymology. Vedic *nici so νικάω* "mache nieder," "lay low." Fick's *Frīkη* < *Fīnkī vincio* is not so good.

κλῖτύς, cf. Hom. *κλίμαξ κλῖσιν*. Alcman 96 *κλείτει*. Herodian makes in the case of *κλειτύς* an exception to his own rule that nouns ending in -vs have i in the preceding syllable. The Etym. Magnum has *ei*. Hesychius *κλείτει*. Nevertheless in Homer and Antigone 1145 *κλιτύς*. Osthoff assumes that both forms are correct and that *κλείτει* is from *κλεῖτυς* (with this accent) and *κλῖτύς* from *κλιτ-έF-*. We accept this explanation, as we undoubtedly have τ for ι in several words (*e. g. στίβη*) in which the τ must be pre-Homeric. For others the connection between verbal and substantival stems suffices.

'Ερινύς. *'Ερεινύς* CIG II 2415 Paros is of little importance. *'Ερυνύς* (one ν) CIG I 916 Attica. Curtius assumes that from **'Ερενύς* comes the parallel form **'Ερινύς*.

ἴρηξ. *βείρακες* *ιέρακες*, Hesychius, is probably itacistic. The etymology of this and other forms is as yet unexplained. Osthoff connects *ἴρός* *ἴερός*.

πολίτης is said by Meyer to be younger than *πολείτης*, but the latter is never found on Attic inscriptions of early date and is therefore itacistic. *ei* is found in the first century before and after the birth of Christ. *ολβιοπολείτας*, *πολειτᾶν* Byzantium CIG 2060. The same conclusion applies to *οδίτης*.

Under this heading I will insert *aīρω* and *āikōs*, of which it is commonly said that they are contractions of *āeīrō* and *āeikōs*. This explanation is reasserted by Wackernagel (K. Z. XXV 269). The case of *āeīrō aīrō* has been disposed of satisfactorily by Brugmann (K. Z. XXVII 196), who, noticing the difference in the form of contraction between *āeīrō* (spurious diphthong) and *āeīdō* (genuine diphthong) assumes a double formation *Fy-āw=Faiρō* and *d-Fēp-āw*.

āikōs, Iliad XXII 336, is not from *āeikīs ātīkīs* (as maintained by G. Meyer in addition to Wackernagel), but has the normal weak vowel according to the accent. *āeikīs āeikelīos āeikēos* (Simon. Ceos. 13), etc., are irregular with their strong forms. Wackernagel (K. Z. XXV 278) writes *aikōs* and takes refuge in his theory of

distraction to *ἀικῶς* despite the parallel instance *ἀιδές* (Hesiod, *Aspis Her. 477*). *ἀναιδής* in the famous inscription from Corcyra *Δεινία τόδε σάμα τὸν ὄλεσε πόντος ἀναιδής* is not proof that *ai* did not arise from *aī*. To insist upon *aei* as a starting point because of the irregular *aeukīs*, etc., instead of *aī*, is doing violence to the laws of Greek accentuation. Furthermore, *aeuk-* ought to contract *q*, as *ei* is a genuine diphthong, cf. *φδω*. We have nothing to do with the "Uebergang von *ei* in *τ* vor einem Consonanten" that Fröhde (B. B. III 9) finds so remarkable. *τκελος* is a parallel example of accent-shifting changing *ei* to *τ*. Bergk 4 reads *aikēlios* Theognis 1344, and *aī* by that time may have become *ai*.

The relation of Homeric *ἰθίς* to later forms with *ei*, principally in Hesychius, is as yet unexplained. For an elaborate and fanciful explanation by Osthoff see M. U. IV 188.

J. Schmidt (K. Z. XXVI 354) conjectures that as *δῖα* is not feminine to *δῖος*, it can have originated from **deivia* and is = *dēvī*, masc. *dēvd-*; this, however, only in case the *ē* of *dēvī* did not force its way in from *dēvd-*. For this group of words (*διογενής Δῖον Δίη Πανδῆ* in Homer) the old explanation of *διεγος* is satisfactory, though *δῖα* is remarkable.

The relation of Homeric *Ποσειδάων* to later forms with *τ* (*τ* in *Ποσιδήον* as early as Homer) is peculiar and as yet unexplained. The *ei* form is found in the Attic, Ionic, Aiolic, Boeotian, North-Thessalian, Corinthian dialects, that with *i* in Ionic, Attic (name of the month), North-Thessalian, Argive, Arcadian and Corinthian dialects.¹ That the diphthong is genuine and original is proved by the Doric ablaut-form *Ποοΐδααι* (Cauer, No. 17). Were the etymology fixed we might consider the claims of the theory that the *i* in various dialects is from *ei*. That the grammarians did not know what was the archaic form may be learned by comparing La Roche, Hom. Textkritik, p. 345. Venetus A has generally *Ποσιδάων*, which is corrected on the margin.

VERBS WITH *Ī* IN HOMER FOR WHICH *EI* IS FOUND IN INSCRIPTIONS OR IN THE LATER LITERATURE.

ἴκω.² Sappho II 8 *οὐδὲν ἔτ' εἴκει.* *εἴκω* has been improperly assumed by Curtius to be the Doric form (Ahr. II 344). *ἴκω=jacio*

¹ The ablaut in *Ποοΐδααι* (Cauer 17) makes it the more certain that there was a Doric form with *ei*. *τ* in the gen. and dat. before *i* became *σ*. When *σ* stands before *ei* and *ou* it is secondary according to Prellwitz, B. B. IX 331.

² Der Diphthong EI, page 13.

has morphologically nothing in common with *εīkω*, since *η* and *ει* are never interchangeable in an old form. If Sappho's *εīkω* is correct, it is improbable that Homer should have said *īkω*. *īco* in Latin is the most plausible etymology for *εīkω* hitherto adduced, though the *spiritus asper* presents difficulties.

νīφει. *νīφω* is proved to be the old form by Herodian and various well attested readings in Thucydides and Aristophanes, cf. Schmidt, Vocalismus, I 134; Diphthong EI 13. Brugmann (Gr. 119b) believes in a Greek *νīφω* and *νīφω*. The former he places under the weak root-forms despite its long vowel.

λīάζομai is explained by Fröhde as containing *τ* from *τ* < *ει*. Skt. *lāya* "rest," and *līyate* are compared, and *σκuā*, Skt. *chāyā* offered as a parallel to **λīa-*. An insuperable objection to the comparison of *lāya* with *λīάζομai* is the difference in meaning, and it is not even certain whether *līyate* is connected.

πīομai. The only trace of the *ει* form that I have been able to discover is in the gloss of Hesychius *πείσαντες* · *ποτίσαντες*, which is a poor guarantee for the authenticity of the diphthongal orthography. In Homer we find *πīόμενος πīέμεν*, *πīω*: *πīνω*. *Πīομai* has the proethnic long vowel (*pīyatē* in Sanskrit) *πīνω* from *πīνFω*, Vedic *pīnvāns pīnvati*, cf. *δρīνω γīnāti*. *πīομai* and *πīνω* are two forms for expressing the same idea, but are to be referred to coexistent roots of different form.

τīω (thesis 3 times, arsis 30), *τīov*, *τēτīμēνos*, etc., *ἄτīτos*.

τīνω Homer and Theognis.

τīνμai often written *τīν-* in MSS, cf. *τīννūω* in Plutarch.

τīω (15 times) also Attic, *τīov*, etc., *ἄτītros*.

τīνω from Pindar on.

τīнūμenai Eurip.

For **τeiω* we have numerous epigraphic proofs from various dialects dating from the fifth century. These I have collected, "Diphthong EI," page 17.¹ The relation of the forms with long and short vowel is involved in no inconsiderable obscurity, and as no definite conclusion as to their interrelation has as yet been reached, I will summarize the most recent theories on the subject before giving my own explanation.²

(1) Curtius, Verbum² (1877). The old form had the diphthong

¹ Meisterhans, p. 88, says the verbal forms in *ει* are from *τīnω*. There is no epigraphic example of *τeiω*. Futures and aorists with *ει* are very common. The perfect *προτēτeιkev* is Delphic.

² The same holds good of *φθeiω φθīω*, Homeric *φθīnω*, Pindar Attic *φθīnω*.

($\tau\epsilon\omega = c\acute{a}ye$), but judging from the testimony of the Homeric verse, the diphthong before vowels must have yielded in Ionic to the long vowel at a very early date, otherwise we could not account for the short vowel in Homer which became universal in Attic. $\tau\acute{\nu}\omega$ has its long vowel from the influence of the conjugational sign $\nu\nu$: $\tau\bar{i}-\nu\bar{\nu}\omega \tau\bar{i}\nu\bar{F}\omega \tau\bar{i}\nu\nu\omega \tau\bar{i}\nu\omega \tau\bar{i}\nu\omega$. Curtius does not hold that $\tau\bar{i}\nu\bar{F}\omega$ could produce both $\tau\bar{i}\nu\omega$ and $\tau\bar{i}\nu\omega$, but that $\tau\bar{i}\nu\omega$ originated from $\tau\bar{i}\nu\omega$. $\tau\bar{i}\nu\nu\mu\alpha i$ and not $\tau\bar{i}\nu\nu\nu\mu\alpha i$ is the correct form in Homer. Perhaps the original form was * $\tau\bar{i}\nu\nu\mu\alpha i$.

(2) Brugmann (then Brugman) K. Z. XXIV 261. $\tau\bar{i}\nu\nu\mu\alpha i$ (Eurip.) is older than $\tau\bar{i}\nu\nu\mu\alpha i$ (Homer) because it is parallel to *cinōti*, having the weak form: $\tau\bar{i}\nu\nu\mu\alpha i : * \tau\bar{i}\nu\nu\mu i : \zeta\acute{e}n\gamma\nu\mu i : * \zeta\acute{e}n\gamma\nu\nu\mu i$. $\tau\bar{i}\nu\omega$ arose from the change of the $-mu$ to the $-o$ conjugation: $\tau\bar{i}\nu\omega$ is therefore older than $\tau\bar{i}\nu\omega$ as $\ddot{\alpha}\tau\bar{i}\tau\bar{o}s$ is older than $\ddot{\alpha}\tau\bar{i}\tau\bar{o}s$, which received its τ from the analogy of $\tau\bar{i}\sigma\omega \ddot{\alpha}\tau\bar{i}\sigma\alpha$ with their old ι (ϵi). Brugmann appears here to accept the reduction of ϵi to ι . $\tau\bar{i}\nu\omega$ is not from * $\tau\bar{i}\nu\bar{F}\omega$ * $\tau\bar{i}\nu\nu\omega$, because the relation of $\tau\bar{i}\nu\omega$ to $\tau\bar{i}\nu\omega$ cannot be considered apart from that of * $\tau\bar{i}\nu\nu\mu i$ to * $\tau\bar{i}\nu\nu\mu i$, and as $\tau\bar{i}\nu\nu\mu i$ is the older form, $\tau\bar{i}\nu\omega$ must be younger. Brugmann (Gramm. §121) accepts Osthoff's explanation of the parallel forms $\tau\bar{i}\omega$ and $\tau\bar{i}\omega$ given later on, and distinctly rejects the form $\tau\bar{e}\iota\bar{\xi}\omega$, for which see below. Gramm. §57 he declares $\tau\bar{i}\nu\omega$ to be from * $\tau\bar{i}\nu\bar{F}\omega$.

(3) G. Meyer (Griech. Gramm. 1880). §293, $\tau\bar{i}\nu\omega$ from * $\tau\bar{i}\nu\nu\omega$. §113, $\tau\bar{i}\epsilon\omega$ is the older and more correct orthography; from $\tau\bar{i}\epsilon\omega$ comes $\tau\bar{i}\omega$ by itacism. §499, $\tau\bar{i}\nu\omega$ (or $\tau\bar{i}\epsilon\omega$) in conformity with $\tau\bar{i}\omega \tau\bar{i}\epsilon\omega$. $\tau\bar{i}\nu\nu\mu\alpha i = \tau\bar{i}\nu\nu\mu\alpha i$. $\tau\bar{i}\nu\omega$ is compared, §499, with *cinōmi*. Meyer therefore believes that $\tau\bar{i}\nu\omega$ is not weakened from $\tau\bar{i}\nu\omega$ and that the τ of $\tau\bar{i}\nu\omega$ has nothing to do with the τ of $\tau\bar{i}\nu\omega$. Meyer's exact position is difficult to discover.

(4) Osthoff's (M. U. IV 36, 1880) explanation depends on his entire theory of the relation of $\tau i-i-i$. $\tau\bar{i}\omega = c\acute{a}yate$. $\tau\bar{i}\omega$ is also proethnic. $\tau\bar{i}\nu\mu\alpha i$ $\tau\bar{i}\nu\omega$ and $\tau\bar{i}\nu\nu\mu\alpha i$ $\tau\bar{i}\nu\omega$ contain proethnic vowels, cf. Skt. *cinōmi*, Zend *cinaōt*. $\tau\bar{i}\text{-}$ and $\tau\bar{i}\text{-}$ should not be confounded in Greek, since $\tau\bar{i}\text{-}$ belongs originally to all those verbal and nominal forms which had $\tau\bar{i}\text{-}$ in accordance with the laws of Indo-European ablaut (*i. e.* as formulated by Osthoff). The τ asserted itself where ϵi belonged, *e. g.* in the future and sigmatic aorist. ϵi extended itself into the province of τ or ι (*ēστεισιν* in the Arcadian dialect). $\tau\bar{i}\epsilon\omega$ is a new formation for $\tau\bar{i}\text{-}\omega$ or for * $\tau\bar{e}\omega$ and is not = *cāyate*. $\tau\bar{i}\mu\bar{η}$ and $\tau\bar{i}\mu\bar{η}$ arose from the I. E. stem-change *cēimā-* and *cīmā-*.

(5) J. Schmidt (K. Z. XXVII 295, 1883) does not discuss the

entire question. Forms with *ει* before a vowel are analogical formations from tenses where *ει* is followed by a consonant. *ἔστειστων* (Arcadian) is a young form for *ἔστειστων*; the *ει* is due to the influence of future or aorist forms. *φθείω* has its diphthong from *φθείσονται*. Schmidt does not make clear what was the form of the present, of which *φθείσονται* is the future. For an *ει* in fut. or aorist we must have an *ει* in present, else how could the future have *ει*; on what form can it be dependent? Schmidt does not use his theory of accent-gradations (K. Z. XXV) to explain any of these forms. As regards *τείω*, which I hold to be the Homeric form, I have given an explanation (Diphthong EI, pp. 16, 17) differing from the above mentioned, in that I have supposed those verbs that have *ει* before *-ω* to have preserved their diphthongal character by the insertion of an infix jod between the root and the ending. J. Schmidt formulates a law that no diphthong can maintain itself before a vowel *which originally* followed it, except in the Aiolic dialect. This law I sought then to obviate by the assumption of a jod infix which would annihilate the distinction between Aiolic and the other dialects. *ρέω* (Aiolic *ρεύω*) is **ρέϜω* <*ρεύω*, *νεύω* is *νεύϳω* otherwise *νέω* as *ρέω τείω *τέω*. This theory alone can save the diphthongs of such verbs as *τείω φθείω*, etc.; that it is open to grave objections I do not fail to recognize. What I have said (Diphthong EI) in reference to *τείω = *cέyati* is of doubtful validity, since those verbs of the fourth Skt. class with accented root-syllables have unoriginal accent and original weak root-forms. If the form *τείω* is Homeric, it is necessary to explain *τίω* and *τίω* either from it or by some other process. Putting Osthoff's theory aside, I will point out what I think to be the difficulty of Curtius' explanation. Curtius rends asunder the *τ* of *τίνυμαι* and that of *τίνω*; since *τίνω* has its long *τ* from the influence of that very *νω* which we find in *τίνυμαι*. *τίνυμαι* must therefore be for *τείνυμαι*, therefore it can have no similarity to *cinōmi*, unless it be ranked with such forms as *ζέγγνυμι δείκνυμι* with unoriginal strong root. For those who accept the ictus-theory *in extenso* there is an escape from the unfortunate *τ* of *τίνυμαι*, in that very good MSS have *τίνυμαι*, the antepenultimate syllable appearing under the ictus, cf. also *τινύνω*, though little can be proved by an example occurring in Plutarch.

To have recourse here to the theory of metrical compulsion has always seemed to me unjustifiable, and though I believe, as before mentioned, in the possibility of metrical necessity creating certain hexameters which appear to be irregular if we compare

them with the generality of verses, we stand on a surer foundation in accepting a *non liquet* in the case of a form like *τίνυμαι*, the peculiarity of which seems to have escaped notice, rather than read *τίνυμαι* as a *dernier ressort*.¹ That another explanation is possible will be seen later on. It suffices here to have called attention to this weakness of Curtius' position: that *τίνυμαι* is separated from *τίνω*. According to Brugmann the two systems with long and short vowel have supplemented each other when *τίνω* came into existence from *τίσω* (cf. Aiolic *φιλήω* from *φιλήσω*, etc.; *δείκνυμι* from *δείξω*, etc.) and the parallelism of quantities was extended to the other members:

<i>τίνυμαι</i>	
* <i>τίνυμι</i>	<i>τίνω</i>
<i>τίνω</i>	ἄτιτος
ἄτιτος	<i>τίνυμαι</i>

This does not necessitate us to give up the root *τει*: **τεινυμαι* = *τίνυμαι* with later accent. *τίω* might have resulted from the same analogy as *τίνω*. This Brugmann has not seen, or at least fails to mention. The relation of *φθείω* and *φθέω*, *φθίνω* Hom. *φθένω* Pindar and Attic is similar. So far Brugmann's theory seems somewhat plausible, nevertheless there is a fatal difficulty: the separation of the -άνω (Attic -άνω) verbs from those in -ίνω, Attic -ίνω.² This Wackernagel has pointed out (K. Z. XXV 262) and proved by calling to our attention the fact that, as *φθάνω* cannot be separated from *τίνω*, if *τίνω* received its τ from the aorist, *φθάνω* must have received from the same tense an η, **ἔφθηγα*, cf. *ἔφηγα*, etc., and thus have been *φθίνω*. Brugmann's theory is therefore overthrown, and I see no surer method of criticism than to accept the situation, leaving *τίνυμαι* unexplained, if the following explanation by analogy does not please. The long vowel in a form originally requiring the short, may have been generated by a systematization of the group:

* <i>τίνυμέν</i>	* <i>τίνυμαι</i>
* <i>τίνυτέ</i>	* <i>τίνυσαι</i>
* <i>τίνυσόντι</i>	* <i>τίνυται</i>

From **τίνυσόντι* **τίνυται* **τίνω* *τίνω* and *τίνω*. To the new τ forms *τίνω*, etc., *τίνυμαι*, etc., may have been assimilated. Nor does this

¹ De Saussure, Mélanges Graux, p. 745, says that σκεδάννυμεν "redouble sans doute son ν uniquement parce que *σκεδάνύμεν renfermait une succession de trois brèves."

² In his Grammar, § 130, he reverts to the explanation of *τίνω* from *τίνυται*.

explanation necessitate our abandoning *τει* as the original strong form (*τει-νν-μαι* = *τίννυμαι*). For the derivation of verbs in *-νFω* from the third person plural cf. Bezzenger, Beiträge, Vol. IX, "τίνω and ταίνω."

*κτίνω μετακτίθον κτίνυμαι*¹ and *ἀγτίνεω* are to be explained in the same way as *τίνω τίνυμαι*. Verbs in *-νέω* as parallels to those in *-νω* are not uncommon. The theory of diphthongal reduction in this group is therefore invalidated.

ἰδίω Homer, Attic *ἰδίω*. The antepenult is probably long in Homer; it occurs only in the imperfect. *ἴδος* for the first time in Hesiod., Homer *ἰδρός*, Skt. *svidyāmi svedas*, Lat. *sudor* < *svidor*, Old Norse *sveiti*, O. H. G. *sveiz* attest the antiquity of the diphthongal form. I believe here we must assume the existence of a root with long vowel. Sievers has shown that in Skt. and Germanic short *ya*-stems had a consonantal *y* in the suffix, while long *ya*-stems had the vowel *i*,² cf. Skt. *aryā* and *kāvid*. After *✓σFid* we have *ἰ-ω* (the Attic form must be later). Compare *speū-io siū-io* as explained by Osthoff.

οἰκτίρω of the sixth century (Kaibel, No. 1), a form proved to be Attic and introduced into the text of Aeschylus by Kirchhoff, must not be taken to be a case of the reduction of *ει* to *i*, nor must one assert that *οἰκτίρω* is the Homeric form. *οἰκτείρω* is **οἰκτερjω*; *οἰκτίρω* is **οἰκτrjω* with the "schwa" form in *οἰκτρός*.

ῳδίνων appears in the itacistic form *ῳδείνων* CIG 1156 Argos; *ῳδείνει* in an epigram from Pompeii (Dilthey Epigr. gr. Pomp. repert. trias Turici, 1876). Verbs in *-νω* in Greek with *τ* preceding are to be explained as either from *-νFω* or *-νjω*, when the future has the short vowel then from *-νjω*. This is denied by Osthoff (M. U. IV 49) who, to prove the contrary, must have recourse to several most improbable formations by analogy. *ῳδίνω* is like *δίνω* (*δινέω*), Aiolic *δίνω*, *κλίνω*, etc.

If Lith. *grēju* is a congener of *χρίω*, the latter should be *χρείjω*; if Skt. *ghárshāmi* the *τ* is original and from **χíρσω*. The latter explanation is correct. Further examples of *τ* Schmidt, Vocal. II 332. There is no indication of an *ει* form in Greek; *χροιή* is to be separated from this group.

ἴτομεν *ἴτμεναι*, Wackernagel, K. Z. XXV 279, says are incorrect

¹ Old Bulg. *si-nq* should not be adduced as a proof that the *ī* of Homeric *κτίνεω* is proethnic.

² "Unaccented *i* (or *u*) before a vowel acts as a consonant after a short, as a vowel after a long syllable without respect to any other accent-position the word may have." Paul-Braune, V 129.

forms for *εἴομεν εἴμεναι*. G. Meyer (Gram. §591) proposes to read γ 365 “*εἴμεναι* for *ἰμμεναι*.” Munro (Hom. Gram. §80) asserts that the long *i* may stand for *ei*, though in the subj. we expect the longer form of the stem; §384 *ἴομεν* from the shortening of a long vowel before a vowel. The fact that the shorter root of this verb may appear in Skt. with a short vowel when compounded in the optative with a preposition, with the long vowel when uncompounded, has no immediate bearing upon the Greek formation. Curtius says (Verb. I 180) perhaps *μεναι* < *λέ-μεναι*; *ἴομεν* Curtius cannot explain. His adoption of Kägi's proposal that τ is <*ij-* (to which jod reference has already been made in the section concerning *-t̄η*), is but half-hearted. It is improbable that no connection should exist between the τ of *ἴμεναι* and *ἴομεν*. How does Wackernagel explain that *ἴομεν* came into the text instead of *εἴομεν*? We have as yet not seen any reasons adduced by any scholar showing the cause of the substitution. There is furthermore no escape by the explanation of false transcription. All attempts to show *why ei* was displaced have proved futile. It is not my purpose to attempt to clear up the mystery of the τ in these two words, but the fact that *i* appears but 8 times long in *ἴομεν*, 21 times short, and 12 times short in other subjunctive forms, *ἴμεναι* but once, *ἴμεναι* thrice (one verse being an interpolation), makes it not improbable that we have to do with a metrical license in the case of the infinitive, while *ἴομεν* is less clear, since even adherents of the metrical compulsion theory demur to the assumption that a vowel can be lengthened or shortened before another vowel, while there are 111 cases of a vowel lengthening before μ . Whatever difficulties the explanation of the τ in the subjunctive (which expects the strong form) may present, they are not to be compared to those thrown in our way by *ἴομεν*. It does not suffice to say “false form; read *εἴομεν*” without explaining the secret of the substitution.¹ Some offer the feeble defence that *ei* may become τ before a foll. vowel, though they must be aware of the fact that this is not the general mode of diphthongal reduction; the shifting of accent being one cause of the reduction whereby *e* is expelled; *πλείων πλέων* offers an instance of the other

¹ Osthoff's comparison of the long *i* of *īyām īyāsam* with that of *ἴομεν* is inconceivable. Where is there a trace of **iŋv* in the optative, not to speak of the difference of moods? Skt. *dyat dyati* lead us to expect the *ei* form. Furthermore, this very form is found in Sophron. *ώς ειώ* (Hesiod. Op. 617 *ein* has been read *eil*; Lehrs ‘möge gehen’; Rzach *ελών* conj. of Haupt, but the state of the text is such that no great reliance can be placed upon it, though remarkable enough; cf. Ahrens, II 340.

mode. I believe in this case, even if the *metri licentia* theory be rejected, the burden of proof is thrown upon the shoulders of its rejectors. Certainly Brugmann's (Gramm. §142) assertion that the *ī* is from analogy to *στήομεν*, etc., which he assumes to be unoriginal forms, is not convincing. *είομεν* would be parallel to *στήομεν*.

As regards the assumed long *ī* (*naturā*) of Homeric *μίσγω*, if the vowel be really long, no certain explanation has been given; the assumption of a form *μίγγ-σκω*, in which the second guttural is the product of the assimilation of the guttural of the root to the *v* of *vv* (cf. *μίγνυμι*), although put forward by Schmidt, is undemonstrable. We naturally ask the question what has become of the vowel of *vv*, which Schmidt does not answer. But in *μέμυράμ μίξω* the vowel is also supposed to be long, if we accept the consensus of testimony of the Greeks. The same is held to be the case in *μίκτο*. The existence of *ει*-forms on old inscriptions (*Μείξιος, συνμείξας Μείξιας* might lead to the supposition that there existed a form *μείγνυμι*, which is adopted by Curtius (Verbum³ I 165) and by Riemann (Revue de Philologie, V 172). But such a form is contrary to the laws of Greek accentuation, even though we find such irregularities as *δείκνυμι ζεύγνυμι*. Brugmann's remark (Grammar, p. 7) is in a certain sense here applicable: "nicht aber dürfen unerklärte Ausnahmen zur Grundlage von Schlüssen gemacht werden, welche die sonst beobachtete Konsequenz der spontanen Lautbewegungen aufheben sollen." The adoption of a form **μείσγω* (*μεικ-σκω*) is clearly in opposition to the laws governing inchoative formations, and also to the Latin *misceo*. While deference to the authority of the "natural length" of the *i* in *μίσγω* as attested by the Greek grammarians has not been paid by many writers, it is *a priori* incredible that in this single case a diphthongal root should have suffered reduction. Nor is there any ground for asserting that the expulsion of the final consonant of the root should have produced compensatory lengthening. In no other instance has the vowel been lengthened. The forms with *ει* (cf. Diphthong EI, p. 21) are either verbal, depending on an aorist *ζμειξας*, or substantival depending on the same strong tense. They presuppose a present **μείγω*, which never existed in Greek since the inchoative formation is proethnic, and together with the *vv*-form, asserts itself in Greek *μίγω*, to which formation Et. Gudianum, 587, 29 and Anecd. Cram. I 273, 15 offer a weak support. Can the grammarians have been misled in stating that the *i* of *μίσγω*,¹ etc., is long? I do not see

¹ No statement is made by the grammarians that *μίγνυμι* has *ī*, though we should infer it from *μίσγω*.

that any means of proof can be adduced either that such was the case or that it was not, though probability speaks for an error. It has been my intention in so tentative an examination to collect the material and to refrain from assertions that savor of dogmatism. The fact that certain Slavic verbs in *-nq* have a long root-vowel, does not therefore force me into a statement that the *i* of *μίγνυμι* is a similar case of proethnic irregularity.

The result of this investigation may be summarized as follows: In a majority of the instances adduced by Meyer, Fröhde, and in the new cases brought forward by myself as offering a supposed proof of the correctness of the theory hitherto generally accepted, a fair case has been made out against the assumption of the reduction of *ει* to *i*. I. In adverbs from substantival stems, in the dative-locative case-ending, and in many nouns and verbs the change of *ει* to *i* has been disputed. II. We have accepted as cases of the monophthongization *-τι*, *-ιη*, *-ιας*. III. There remain several substantival and verbal formations for which a satisfactory explanation was not reached (*Πολύδος*, *χίλιοι*, *μίσγω*, etc.) Stress must be laid upon the fact that the root-syllable is the least, if at all affected, while suffix-forms, which adapt the root to particular purposes, are more readily exposed to weakening, even though they are bearers of the chief accent. Greek and Germanic are herein different; in the latter it is the unaccented syllables which are mutilated.

It is no new truth that in dealing with questions which depend for their solution to a greater or less degree upon pronunciation, the *errare est humanum* is peculiarly applicable. We are inclined to treat forms of Greek grammar as if from the time of Homer on they were pronounced with undeviating regularity. Every law in language has, as every art, its chronological conditions. A combination of sound retains its peculiar character, if it has been produced after the cessation of the operation of a law, which, if still active, would have necessitated an alteration. So, it is because the pronunciation of the Greeks, varied as it must have been by time and by dialect influence, cannot be resuscitated that we fail to explain many forms, and if such words as *χίλια* in Homer and *χέλλιοι* in Aiolic, *χείλιοι* in Boeotian seem incompatible with each other, as a *dernier ressort* we may take refuge in the fluctuation of pronunciation in particular words which undoubtedly had its influence upon orthography, and beg the indulgence of those who demand absolute conformity with phonetic law.

HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.

November 6th, 1885.

II.—PHILLIPPS GLOSSARY.

Extracts from a Glossary in the Phillips Library at Cheltenham.

The following glosses, copied from a codex in the Phillipps Library at Cheltenham, numbered 4626, have been communicated to the Journal by Robinson Ellis. I have added, at his request, a few notes, chiefly referring to parallel glosses found elsewhere. It will be observed that many of the glosses agree closely with Festus or Paulus, while others seem to be drawn from Isidorus. A great many too are to be found in the so-called Thesaurus Novus Latinitatis, published in volume VIII of Mai's *Classici Auctores*. For brevity I have often referred to the *Glossarium of De Vit* (*De Vit*). Words printed in small capitals will be found explained in the *Forcellini—De Vit Lexicon*.

MINTON WARREN.

M

1. Macedonia Emathia Mecedes per sincopam dicuntur macedones lucanus sic alterna duces bellorum uulnera passos in Macedium terras miscens aduersa secundis servavit fortuna pares.

Maspiter mars quasi maris pater.

Martulus a marte diminuitur.

Mavors mars fortis.

5. Mavortita excussor equitis de equo.

Maleglorius male glorians.

Mancus dicitur quasi manuncus.

Manni mansueti quasi ad manum sequentes qui et burides dicuntur.

Matutinus comparatur matutinior issimus.

10. Maturus facit superlativum maturrimus et maturissimus.

Mammillare est diutius quam decet ad mammam pendere mamman lactare mammille proprie dicuntur uirorum mamme feminarum.

(1) Cf. Lucan, V 2.

(2) Cf. Varro, L. L. IX 75, and Mai, *Auctores Classici*, VIII, p. 364, Maspiter, Marspater vel maris cuiuslibet pater.

(3) Cf. Caper, Orthogr. 105, 21 Keil.

(5) Cf. De Vit. *Glossarium*, under Mavortini.

(7) Cf. Isidorus, *Origines*, X 180, Mancus, manu ancus.

(8) Cf. Isid. XII 1, 55, quem vulgo buricum vocant.

Magistratus aliquando significat personam ut cum dicitur magistratus hunc iubet aliquando honorem ut cum dicitur augusto datus est magistratus Magistratus pretor uel consul Magister nomen compositum est ex greco et latino sterio enim grece statio dicitur inde magister quasi maior statione a quo magistellus et magistro as et magisterculus Magister autem multis modis cum aliis nominibus componitur ut magister militum *i* qui militibus preest, magister aqualiculus *i* pincerna magister a responsis *i* qui dat responsa magister abatis (?) *i* qui mensuris preest, magister a commentariis *i* cancellarius et multa his similia.

Magmentum dicitur quasi magis augmentatum sicut mactus (erasure) magis auctus a mangeo es quod est magis augere Inde ma^gtus a um g conuersa in c et macte aduerbium uel interiectio bene alicui optantis Virgiliius macte nova uirtute puer.

Mactici dicuntur malati *i* magnarum malarum homines

oribus late patentibus qui et malaxati uocantur quasi maxillati malaxater etiam dicitur subactus contritus mollitus malaxan enim est aliquid terendo mollire.

15. Maritus aliquando ponitur pro maritatus Ouidius et fas omne facit fratre marita soror.

Mangones lucriones qui in mercatibus faciendis quasi mediatores hinc inde sua lucra conquirunt qui uulgo mangani appellantur. Mangana autem sunt bellice quedam machinule.

Manzer dicitur qui de adulterio nascitur Sinzugius uero de quolibet scorto manzer ris Inde manzerinus a um *i* adulterinus.

Maredus udus madidus.

Madussa dicitur ebrius a greco madan hoc est a madendo eo quod madeat uino.

20. Mala grece dicitur obsterix.

Mala mantica eo quod quasi duas pendentes malas *i* maxillas habeat.

Maleiurus periurus.

Magnati potentes nobiles.

(12) Cf. Isid. X 170, magister maior in statione: nam στερὸν Graece statio dicitur, and Paulus, p. 126.

(13) Cf. fragmentatum, Paulus, p. 126 (Ellis).

(14) Cf. mattici, Paulus, p. 126 (Ellis).

(15) Cf. Ovid, Her. IV 134.

(16) For lucriones cf. Paulus, p. 56, the only other passage where it seems to occur, cf. Lucrio, Petron. 25; for manganus cf. De Vit.

(17) With sinzugius compare synzugiae = syzugiae, Isid. I 16, 1, and synzugiare, Mai, VIII 565.

(18) So De Vit.; cf. Loewe, Prodromus, p. 353.

(19) Cf. madulsa, Paulus, p. 126; madan = μαδᾶν.

(20) = Maia, cf. Loewe, Prod. p. 423.

Machiones dicuntur cementsarii a machinis quas surrigunt surgentibus muris.

25. Mater dicitur quasi materia quod sit causa materialis in qua fit pater uero causa efficiens. Inde matercula i^r parua mater et matertera i^r matris soror dicta matertera quasi mater altera et matrix i^r locus conceptionis et matrisso matrissas quod est matrem imitari et matrimes sive matrimus i^r qui matrem adhuc habet superstitionem sicut patrimes dicitur qui patrem habet. Matertera magna dicitur patris uel matris matertera. Mater dicitur que filium habet matersfamilias que plures Matersfamilias olim non dicebatur donec uir eius paterfamilias dictus esset nec possunt plures in una familia hoc nomine appellari preter unam que nec filii careat nec marito et que familiam suam materno regat affectu.

Malus aliquando paruum significat et per contrarium bonus magnum Iuuenal is terra malos

homines nunc educat atque pusillos.

Machama quida genus monstri.

Macticora (altered to mácticora) bestia quedam terribilis in india.

Manticula mantellaria.

30. Mantum quoddam breue indumentum quod manus tegit tantum unde et a manu dicitur.

Manubie ornamenta regum Vnde patronius ait tot regum manubie penes fugitivum reperte.

Mattula parua matta.

Mandugaris genus frugis i^r siligo.

Mansioniles sunt terrarum spacia ad manendum metata.

35. Mansuales uero sive manusuari ipsi habitatores.

Malum mortuum dicitur quedam species apostematis quod inflare solet gulas et fauces unde etiam interdum aliqui suffocantur.

Maliarum pomum quod malum terre dicitur.

Malocidonius arbor similis stiraci.

(24) Cf. Isid. XIX 8, 2.

(25) Cf. Paulus, p. 125, under matersfamiliae (Ellis), and Mai, VIII, p. 356.

(26) Cf. Juvenal, 15, 70.

(28) See Liddell and Scott, s. V. Μαντιχώρας Μαρτιχόρας. Add Philostr. Vit. Apoll. 45.

(30) Cf. Isid. XIX 24, 15.

(31) Petronius (Ellis), cf. Frag. XII, Buecheler, p. 111.

(32) Cf. Paulus, p. 125.

(33) Read magudaris.

(37) ? Cf. De Vit. malarium: pomarium arbor quae fert poma = Mai, VIII, p. 366.

(38) Compound of malus and cydonius, cf. Pliny, N. H. XII, 124, where he speaks of the styrax as cotoneo malo similis.

Marcus maior malleus Mar-
culus minor Marcellus mediocris.

40. Marra (?) ulubius tere-
brum.

Malleoli parui mallei Malleoli
quoque dicuntur nouelli palmites
prioris anni flagellis innati a
similitudine malleorum dicti
quod in ea parte qua reciduntur
ex ueteribus sarmentis promi-
nentes utrumque mallei speciem
habent. Unde et mallei appelle-
lantur.

Mnasiterna uas aque i urceus
Plautus effer mnasiternam cum
aqua foras. Coliburnus quoque
ubi tu mnasiternatus aquam
petas.

Matelio diminuitur a matula.
Sunt autem uasa urine.

Mamononium scutella.

45. Mazonium genus sciphi.

Manopera mercennaria ma-
num operatio Inde manoper-
arius.

Maiestas honor potestas dicta
maiestas quasi maior statio.

Madit coquit exurit.

Macellat interficit.

50. Macellarius sicca bucida
(dot in darker ink).

Macellum a macerandis carni-
bus dicitur.

Mancipi nomen indeclinabile
est dicitur autem mancipi quod
de manu transfertur ad manum
ut codex. Mancipare est in
seruitutem redigere sub potestate
mittere Emancipare uero de
potestate mittere. Que manu-
missio fieri ita solet ut dominus
caput serui tenens dicat hunc
hominem liberum esse uolo et
sic emittat eum e manu.

Manceps pis et mancipium
pii idem.

Meotide paludes sunt inter
ripheos montes et cimericum
mare fere semper gelate ita ut
plaustra onusta sustineant. Vnde
lucanus Ripheasque manus et
quas tenet equore denso Pigra
palus scyti patiens meotida
plaustri.

(39) Cf. Isid. XIX 7, 2.

(40) ? Verrubius (Ellis), cf. De Vit. from Gloss. Pap., marra; terebrum id est
verrubius.

(41) Cf. Paulus, p. 135.

(42) Cf. Paulus, p. 169, read nassiterna—Calpurnius—nassiternatus, probably
taken from Fulgentius.

(43) Cf. Paulus, 126.

(44 and 45) Cf. MAZONOMUS.

(46) Gloss. Pap. has madit; exurit coquit.

(49) Gloss. Pap. Macellare occidere, inde Macellum locus et Macellarii
homines.

(50) Sica is perhaps a gloss for macera = machaera, which is found associated
in glosses with *macellum*, cf. De Vit.; bucida seems to be a compound like
homicida, not = bucaeda.

(51) Cf. De Vit. under *macera*.

(54) Cf. Lucan, II, 640 f.

55. Melibeus dicitur ad quem cura boum pertinet i' bubulus.

Mercedarius sive mercedonius dicitur qui mercedem dat Mercennarius sive merceditus q u accipit.

Mercedula parua merces.

Metellus mercennarius messor a metendo dictus.

Medioximus medius uel medio proximus. Plautus ita mediis superi inferi et medioximi.

60. Mediastinus qui in medio lauantium stat.

Mentiriosus mendax Mentiri est contra mentem ire i' scienter mentiri.

Menticulare est mendaciis et dolis attemptare.

Metapus fatuus.

Metodicus medicus metodus remedium.

65. Mediannus componitur a medio et anne.

Meriops dicitur parum uidens in die meriops pis.

Melior dicitur quasi mollior i' flexibilis suadibilior.

Melancoriphus aus quedam que grece atricapilla dicitur eo quod in summo capites sit nigra.

Menominus insanus.

70. Merops uermis quidam Merops quoque dicitur aus quedam que et gaulus appellatur que et parentes suos recondere et alere pertubitur (?)

Merosin grece linteola uel fasciole dicuntur.

Menica membranula uentris.

Mecanemata dicuntur que mechanica arte fiunt.

Mecania dicuntur fabrorum ingenia.

75. Melias hasta.

Meritorium lupanar meretri cum uel taberna uini a mero i' uino dictum.

Menalia solaria de cenaculorum parietibus eminentia.

Menio menia facio Inde menico as quod est munire.

(55) Cf. Vergil, Ecl. I, 6.

(58) Cf. Festus, p. 146, under metalli, which does not agree, but is imperfect (Ellis).

(61) Probably for mendosus, cf. De Vit. under mentiriosus.

(62) Cf. Gloss. Pap. menticulare, dolis et fallaciis attentare vel divinari.

(63) Perhaps a corruption of mente captus; cf Festus, p. 158; Paulus, p. 159, and De Vit. under mecapus and metapus.

(64) Read methodicus, cf. Cels. praef. §13.

(66) Corruption of muops, cf. Fulgentius Expos. Serm. Antiq. p. 561.

(68) Cf. MELANCORYPHOS and Paulus, p. 124.

(69) = μανόμενος.

(70) Cf. Isid. XII 71, 34, meropes eosdemque gaulos, etc.

(72) Cf. MENINGA.

(75) Cf. Paulus, p. 124, melia hasta a ligno male dicta.

(77) Cf. MAENIANUM and Festus, p. 134.

(78) Read moenio; moenia facio inde moenico = munico, cf. Paulus, p. 152.

Meaptim meo more meaptim
iurauit i: mecum iurauit.

80. Meopte meo ipsius.

Meapte mea propria causa.

Metacismus est ubi m sequitur
uocalis ut bonum aurum.

Metuo is in actiuia uoce pas-
siuam habet significationem
lucanus dum semper metuor
terraque expector ab omni.

Medullatim medullitus.

85. Misellio dicitur qui non
est certe sententie sed uarius in
iudiciis suis ac multiplex.

Mirachiton prime adolescentie.

Mirior antiqui comparatim
dicebant a miro Titinnius mirior
tibi uideor.

Miropola dicitur unguentarius
unde nevu is Miropola inquit
statim mihi unguentum largitus
est quo me venustarem.

Miropolion grece dicuntur
stationes ubi pigmenta uendun-
tur.

90. Minister dicitur quasi mi-

nor statione uel quia manibus
debitum explet officium.

Mirones fantasie miratores.

Mista grece misterii auctor
inde per compositionem simmista
i: misterii conscius Misterium
secretum uel sacramentum.

Minicus ericu*s*.

Migdale ignota bestia quam
tamen similem cameleunti di-
cunt.

95. Minotaurus monstrum ex
homine i: pasiphe et tauru geni-
tum tauri caput habens per
cetera ut homo. Vnde Ovidius
semibovemque uirum Semiui-
rumque bovem 'h effigies inter
militaria signa habetur signifi-
cans ita occulta esse debere
consilia ducum sicut fuit illius
domicilium i: laberintus.

Minutal genus cibi ex piscibus
oleribusque concisis.

Minutal pars denarii Iuuenalis
Hesternum solitus medio seruare
minutal Septembri.

(79) Read meatim, cf. Neue, II 669. The grammarians cite no example of its use. The example here given may go back to Verrius Flaccus, compare 80 with Festus, p. 310.

(80) For meapte causa see Ter. Haut. 686.

(82) Cf. Isid. I 31, 6.

(83) Cf. Lucan, V 671.

(84) For medullitus, cf. Paulus, p. 123; the form medullatim is new.

(85) Read miscellio, cf. Paulus, p. 123.

(86) Cf. miracidion, Paulus, p. 123, where Mueller notes *mirachiton* boni codd.

(87) Cf. Paulus, p. 123.

(88) Cf. Fulgentius, Exp. Serm. Antiq. p. 566, 17.

(90) Cf. above 12, and Isid. X 170.

(91) Cf. Loewe, Prodromus, p. 426.

(92) Read MYSTA and SUMMYSTA.

(93) Read MINICIUS, cf. Cod. Sangallensis 912, M. 90.

(94) ? Cf. MYGALE.

(95) Cf. Ovid, Ar. Am. II 23, and Paulus, p. 148.

(97) Cf. Juvenal, XIV 129.

Mirrina potio diuina potio
quae grece nectar sive
mirratum uinum.

Mirrin genus optimi nitri et
saphirini coloris unde mirrina-
uasa sunt.

100. Morbosus moribundus.

Milisie amatoria gesta [Mile-
siae].

Mola aliquando uocatur far-
tostum et sale conspersum quod
eo molito hostie consperguntur
Virgilii sparge molam et fra-
giles incende bitumine lauros.

Monile quoddam muliebre
ornamentum a collo ad pectus
dependens dictum a monendo
eo quod moneat mulierem ut sit
subdita uiro.

Monnitio ciborum morsica-
tio.

105. Molucrum tumor uentris.
Molucus quoque dicitur illud
quo mole uertuntur.

Momentana duabus lancibus

et uno in medio stilo librata
equaliter constat.

Monimen monitio.

Monimentur amoris insigne.

Monodia grece cum unus
canit Monodian grece dicitur
longum carmen.

110. Mortarium dicitur eo
quod in eo semina iam mortua
tundantur Inde mortariolum.

Morteta sunt terne id est calide
aque de terra scatentes dicte
terme eo quod sint quasi de
tumulis mortis manantes.

Mortem obiit i' ad mortem
iuit quemadmodum dicebant
antiqui ob troiam ductum exer-
citum i' ad troiam.

Matinum morticorum i' morte
cesum.

Molliarcere partem extrahere.

115. Mulciber dicitur uulcanus
a mulcendo ferrum.

Mulceator blandiloquus a mul-
cendo dictus.

(98) Cf. murrina, Paulus, p. 144, and murrata potionē, p. 159.

(99) Cf. MURRA, or MURRHA.

(100) Cf. Paulus, p. 139.

(102) Cf. Paulus, p. 140; Festus, p. 141; Verg. Ecl. VIII 82.

(103) Cf. Isid. Diff. I, n. 382.

(104) Cf. Paulus, p. 143, munitio morsicatio ciborum, and see MORSICATIO.

(105) Cf. Festus, p. 141; 106, cf. MOMENTANA.

(107) Monimen is not given by dictionaries, but may have occurred in Festus, cf. Paulus, p. 139, monumentum, and Mai, VIII, p. 352, Item a moneo hoc monimen, et inde hoc monumentum.

(110) Cf. Isid. IV 11, 7.

(111) Cf. Mai, VIII, p. 538, mortetum aqua calida de terra manans quasi
mortetum quia ab inferis credebatur manare, see Myrteta, Hor. Ep. I 15, 5,
read thermae.

(112) Cf. Paulus, p. 147.

(113) Cf. morticinium, Mai, VIII, p. 338.

(114) Cf. Gloss. Pap. molliarcere, extrahere, parcere.

(116) Cf. Loewe, Prod. p. 358.

Mugistrio uersutus.

Murcisso callidus veterator.

Mugisson irrigor.

**120. Mulier dicitur a mollicie
quasi mollier.**

**Muscidus desidiosus inac-
tuosus.**

**Murio dicitur cum uxor me-
chatur ipso conscientia et tacente.**

**Mustela dicitur quasi mus
longus.**

**Musaraneum animal perex-
guum solifugum simile aranee.**

Muret leniter stillat.

125. Murena. Inde murenule
dicuntur a similitudine murene
serpentis sunt autem quedam
ornamenta que a capite ad cerui-
cem ornandam descendunt auri
uirgulisi et argenti contexta.

**Mullei quoddam genus calcia-
menti a nullando dicti nullare
enim consuere est.**

Mutatoria festiva indunenta.

**Mundus dicitur muliebris or-
natus quasi lotus et nitidus.**

**Muringe pellicule cerebri in
anteriori parte capitidis.**

(117-119) See De Vit. under mugissor, and mergisco, and Cod. Sangallen.
912, M. 176.

(121) See Loewe, Prod. p. 283, and MURCIDUS.

(122) Read morio, cf. Loewe, Prod. p. 19.

(124) Perhaps for manat, cf. Paulus, p. 128, manare dicitur, quum humor ex
integro sed non solidi nimis per minimas suas partes erumpet, etc.

(125) Cf. MURAENULA.

(126) Cf. Festus, p. 142; Paulus, p. 143.

(128) Cf. Paulus, p. 143.

(129) Cf. MENINGA.

(130) Read musculi, cf. Isid. XI 1, 117.

(131) Cf. Isid. XVIII 11, 4.

(132) Cf. Isid. XIX 1.

(133) Read telonarius, cf. Juvenal, XIV 271.

(134) Cf. Paulus, p. 144.

**130. Musciculi capita neruo-
rum qui et mures dicuntur mus-
ciculi dicuntur sure brachiorum
uel tybarum.**

Musculus genus bellice ma-
chine unde muri dissoluuntur
simil' cuniculo Vnde et musculus
dicitur quasi murusculus. Mus-
culus etiam dicitur partim (sic)
curtum quoddam nauigium.

Municipium castellum com-
posito nomine a munere et capio-
pis. Inde municipatus et muni-
ceps et municipalis qui in hoc
differunt quod municipes dicun-
tur curialium maiores municipa-
les uero originis cives sunt et
aliquid officium gerentes. Muni-
ceps thelonarius Iuuenalis
Municipes Louis advexit
lagenas.

Mussat dubitat uel submur-
murat Vnde Ennius in occulto
inquit mussabat Idem Non decet
mussare bonos.

135. Mutuo as et mutuor aris
idem antiquitus Quod et de
accipiente dicitur et de dante.

Inde mutuum i· et mutuo aduerbium i· uicissim.

Mutire submusitare.

Mulcat calcat uexat truncat.

Musinatur placat mulcet lenit blanditur.

139. Mutamen mutatio sicut dicitur solamen meditamen purgamen ligamen spectamen peccamen luctamen salutamen uitulamen quod interpretatur generatio. Vitulus enim grece et animal significat et generationem.

N

Naumatium locus ~~quietus~~^{et} (sic) publicus et secretus sicut est in theatris et in circo Vnde et patronius ait In naumatium memet ipsum conieci.

Napta genus est fomenti apud chaldeos et persas quo nutruntur incendia uel ut quidam dicunt ossa olivarum cum amurca projecta.

Nagat uacillat.

Nepos qn filium filii significat masculinum est cum uero luxuriosum commune dicitur autem

nepos qui parentum bona prodigit luxuriosi ac decoquit a nepa serpente i· scorpio qui natos suos omnes interimit preter unum qui dorso eius insederit hic in setis patris seruatus ipsum parentem suum interimit.

5. Nenie dicuntur egyptaphia quae scribuntur super tumbos mortuorum Nenie quoque uocantur ficte quedam lamentationis quas conducte mulierculae plangendi perite in exequiis faciunt defunctorum et merito huiusmodi planctus nenie uocantur quasi inanes conficti non ueri dicuntur etiam nenie ficte quedam et inanes cantilene nutricum circa uagientes infantes quibus eos quiescere faciunt et dormire Nenie nuge Nenios nugax neniantur nugatur.

Nequam proprie non iniquum significat sed inutilem dictus nequam quasi nec quisquam.

Neccerim nec eum.

Neruui sunt quidam populi gallie quorum ciuitas est tornacus sine cameracu qui cotam pre-

(136) Cf. Festus, p. 156, read submussitare, see Festus, p. 298.

(139) Cf. De Vit. under *musinari*.

(140) *Mutamen* is not given among the derivatives from *muto* in Mai, VIII 341. The other words except *salutamen* are all in Lexx.

(1) Perhaps for *naumachium*, cf. De Vit. and Buecheler, Petronius Frag. XIII, from Fulgentius, *aumatium* dicitur locus secretus publicus sicut in theatris aut in circo, unde et Petronius Arbiter ait in *aumatium* memet ipsum conieci.

(2) Cf. De Vit.

(3) Cf. NAGO, and Mai, VIII, p. 385, *nagare*: vacillare huc illuc que fluctuare.

(4) Cf. Isid. X 193, and Placidus, p. 70.

(5) Cf. Hildebrand, Glossarium Latinum, N 56 with note.

(7) Cf. Festus, p. 162; Paulus, p. 163.

(8) Cf. Lucan, I 429.

fectum cesaris occiderunt. Vnde Lucanus nimiumque rebellis Neruius et cesi pollutus sanguine Cote.

Niger aliquando significat turpem in moribus Horatius qui risus hominum captat famamque dicacis fingere qui non uera potest commissa tacere *qui nequit hic niger est* (these 5 words written after an erasure by a different hand) hunc tu romane caveto.

10. Nimbus est fasciola transuersa ex auro in linteo quod est in fronte matronarum Vnde plautus quo magis eam aspicio tanto magis est nimbata.

Noctiorus dicitur qui melius uidet ueste quam in die.

Noctiluca uermis in nocte lucens.

Noniplum dicitur novies multiplicatum sic quaduplum quincuplum sexcuplum septuplum octuplum decuplum.

Nox dicitur a nocendo quod oculis noceat.

15. Nocticula dicitur luna uel parua nox.

Nudipes nudis pedibus incedens.

Nusciosus dicitur qui uicio oculorum parum uidet.

Nux et pro arbore ponitur et pro fructu Inde nucilla i^r parua nux Nuces generaliter dicuntur omnia poma que nucleo exuuntur Virgilius Castaneeque nuces exicabantur in hortis.

Nugas uerbum hebreum significans inutilem et praeue mentis hominem et est indeclinabile Quo tamen iam pro latino utentes declinamus nugax. cis. Inde nuge nugarum et nugator et nugigerulus et nugor nugaris.

20. Numerus uel a numeria dea dicitur uel a numa pumpilio qui primus repperit numerum apud romanos antiqui enim in prosperitate albis lapillis numerabant in aduersitate nigris unde persius hunc macrine diem numero meliore lapillo.

Nudipedalia dicuntur iudaice quedam obseruantie nudis pedibus ambulandi.

Nutrio is et nutrico as ita dis-

(9) Cf. Hor. Sat. I 4, 83 ff., where the MSS give *visa*.

(10) Cf. Isid. XIX 31, 2.

(11) Cf. Loewe, Prod. p. 17, and Festus, p. 173, nuscitosus.

(12) Cf. Mai, VIII, p. 370, nocticula et noctiluca vermis quidam nocti lucens.

(13) Nonplus I have not been able to find elsewhere, cf. NONCUPPLUS.

(14) Cf. Isid. V 31, 1.

(15) Cf. De Vit.

(17) Cf. 11.

(18) Cf. Vergil, Ecl. II 52, for castaneaeque nuces.

(20) Cf. Mai, VIII, p. 377, and Perseus, II 1.

(21) Cf. NUDIPEDALIA.

(22) Of these words nutritura is found only in Cassiodor. de Amicit, 37; morsura, aratura, solidatura, falcatura, ferratura, furcatura are not found; pertusura is given by Lexx.

tinguuntur nutriunt mulieres
nutrificant uiri nutricii Nutrio is
et nutritor is idem Virgilius hanc
pinguem et placidam paci nu-
tritor oliuam Inde nutritura haec
nutritura huius ture sicut dicitur
hec morsura huius sure. hec
ambulatura huius re. hec cava-
tura huius re. hec politura
huius re hec messura huius re.
hec rasura huius re. hec cul-
tura huius re. hec aratura huius
re. hec curuatura huius re. hec
fractura huius re. hec solidatura

huius re. hec pertusura huius
re. hec percussura huius re.
hec nugatura huius re. hec
falcatura re. ferratura re. fur-
catura re.

Nubere operire Inde nubere
dicitur mulier quando traditur
uiro qzamborum ibi capita solent
nubi i' operiri Inde etiam nubes
dicitur aeris densitas a uento
conglobati.

Nubere et enubere ita distin-
guuntur Nubit ciuis cui enubit
extraneo.

III.—THE ULTIMATE DERIVATION OF ESSAY.¹

A discussion of the origin of an English word at the present time naturally starts with the derivation assigned to it in Professor Skeat's Etymological Dictionary. Under *Essay* he there says: "From O. Fr. *essai*, a trial—Lat. *exagium*, weighing, a kind of weight, from Gk. ἔξαγιον [not ἔξάγιον], a weighing (White and Riddle, Lat. Dict.)—Gk. ἔξαγειν, to lead out, export merchandise—Gk. ἔξ, out, and ἀγεῖν, to lead. See Agent." A brief examination of some of these statements will show the dangers that beset an inquirer when he passes out of the region to which he has devoted the study of a specialist, and how all-important to scientific etymology it is never to neglect the maxim, μέμνασθαι τὸ πρωτότοπον, which Curtius took as the motto of his *Grundzüge*. To begin with, White and Riddle's Latin Dictionary should never be quoted as an authority on Latin derivations. Both the forms, ἔξαγιον no less than ἔξάγιον, are found in Greek, although the latter is the original one. The meaning in Greek is not generally a 'weighing,' but a *weight*, though there are traces of the other usage, as will be seen below. ἔξάγιον cannot possibly be derived from ἔξαγειν in any sense, at least not until such a formation has been established by the most unquestionable parallels. The proper Greek verbal is, of course, ἔξαγωγή. Again, it is not clear what is the connexion of ideas between *leading out* or exporting merchandise and *weighing*. Under *Examine* and *Exact* Skeat refers us to the Lat. *ex*, out, and *agere*, to drive. So that *driving* (*agere*) and *leading (ἀγεῖν) out* seem both to be capable of producing the idea of *weighing*. The truth is that neither the Greek *ἀγεῖν* means to 'lead,' nor the Latin *agere* to 'drive.' They both mean properly and originally to set in motion. *Examen* (*ex-ag-men*) is the tongue of the balance that is *moved* by the weights in the scales; *ἀγεῖν*, to weigh (so much, neuter), is to move or pull down the scale pan. *Sed haec hactenus.*

To begin with the beginning, I shall take it as established that

¹ The following article is based upon a paper which was read before the Philological Society of London, June 19, 1885, and of which a brief abstract was published in its Proceedings.

the English *essay* is from the Old Fr. *essai*, and this again from the Latin *exagium*. We have then to consider what is the relation of this last to the Greek *ἐξάγιον*. One of the two must be the other borrowed. But which of them is it? Only chronology can settle this question. The earliest occurrence of the word in literature is in the works of Zeno, who was Bishop of Verona in A. D. 368, and died about 380, *Sermo ad neophytes* 6 (ii 44 §2, p. 252 Ballerini), "denique et uos retinetis pondus antiquum; habetis aginam: exagium facite quemadmodum ultis; singulos ponderate; inuenietis nullum habere minus. tripondes sunt omnes, numismatis sacri una libra signati, qui mensae deseruant." Dr. Hort, to whose assistance in this and some other portions of this paper I am much indebted, writes that "This is part of a passage comparing the neophytes to good loaves of bread; but the details are obscure." Two things, however, are clear: (1) that the word *exagium* must have been sufficiently familiar to the popular consciousness to serve as the basis of a simile, and (2) that in the same popular consciousness the verbal *exagium* was felt to be connected with the common name *agina*.

Next we have in the *Collationes* of Cassianus (A. D. 419-427) I 22, "sive illa quorum pondus ac pretium aerugo uanitatis arrodens *exagio* seniorum adaequari non sinit ut numismata leuia atque damnosa minusque pensantia recensemus." The previous context, as Dr. Hort points out, shows that the *seniores* are the Prophets and the Apostles; and the use of *exagium* marks that the persons in question fall below their standard. An earlier example is found on an inscription giving the words of an edict published by Turcius Apronianus *praefectus urbi* A. D. 362 and 372, enacting that animals for the future should be sold by weight (Orelli, Inscr. 3166, Gruter, 647, 6), "ratio docuit, utilitate suadente, consuetudine micandi summota, sub *exagio* potius pecora vendere quam digitis colludentibus tradere," which is followed immediately by "*ad penso* pecore," and lower down by "*caro fide ponderis* comprobata," with which should be compared Cod. Theodos. XIV, Tit. 4, illud quoque a decessore tuo salubriter institutum est quo suariis aestimandi licentia denegetur pondusque porcorum *trutinae examine* non oculorum libertate quaeratur.¹

So far, then, we have no example of *exagium* as old as Constantine. And yet we have some reason for believing that the term was

¹ In a later inscription (Gruter, 1114, 7), assigned by Orelli to about 484, the phrase used is *stateras fieri*.

introduced or brought into general currency in that prince's reign. One of the benefits which Constantine conferred upon his subjects was the rehabilitation of the gold coinage of the empire. In the new monetary system which he introduced, probably in the year 312, the gold pound was taken as the unit; and the standard gold coin was fixed at $\frac{1}{2}$ of that weight, that is to say, $\frac{1}{6}$ of 1 oz., or a *sextula*, as it was called. This coin was called the *solidus*, a name which was already in popular use for a full or large gold piece as opposed to a light or small one.¹ The weight of the coin is established not only by the definite statements of writers on the subject, but by the actual occurrence of the numerals LXXII on a *solidus* of Constantine.² According to Eckhel, *Doctrina numorum ueterum*, VIII, p. 511, the equivalence of the pound of gold and the 72 standard *solidi* was so universally recognized that it gave rise to affected expressions like that of the Christian poet Sedulius (5th cent.), who called the 72 Disciples 'auream libram,' and that in the *Acta* of the Synod of Sinuessa, where the quorum of 72 bishops which deposed the pope Marcellinus is called 'solidorum libra occidua.'³ The fact that the *solidus* was a weight of gold is brought

¹ Its origin from an adjective is well shown in the earliest place where it occurs, Apuleius *Met.* 10, 9 (Hildebrand), 'centum aureos solidos offerens pretium,' 'good, broad gold pieces,' and perhaps in Lampridius, *Alex. Seuerus*, 39, a well-known *crux*, 'confilari quartarios iussit et tremisses tantum solidos—que fieri.' But the substantival use is as old as Ulpian (killed A. D. 228), who cites from a *Praetor's* edict, 'multet poena solidorum X eum qui in subgrunda protectone id positum habeat cuius casus nocere cui possit,' *Dig.* 9, 3, 5. Other passages are *Vulg. I Esdr.* 2, 69; 8, 27; *I Par.* 29, 7, and *Claudian*, *Epigr.* 42, 3, 'sex emptus solidis' (not quoted in the *lex.*). It gradually superseded *aureus* as the name of the standard monetary unit; and this caused it to lose caste as time went on. Now it has sunk to the Fr. *sou*!

² H. Cohen, *Les Monnaies VI*, p. 112, n., where, however, he wrongly cites a silver coin of Constans I (No. 22, p. 248) (which is inscribed with LX) as containing the same inscription. The letters OB, which frequently appear in coins and have been explained as the Greek numerals for 72 (Hultsch, *Metrologie*, p. 327 and notes, following Mommsen), are of too uncertain an interpretation to base any argument upon. See Cohen, VI 392, where the whole matter is discussed.

³ The passage in Sedulius is *Carm. Pasch.* IV 154, "discipulosque alios quorum mens conscientia recti puraque simplicitas, numero meritoque resplendens *aurea libra fuit*," for which the *Opus Paschale* has "duos et septuaginta discipulos qui numero meritoque conspicui libra digni in aurea nuncupari" (the allusion being to the disciples whom Christ sent out, Luke XI 17, and who, according to some MSS and versions, were 72 in number). The second passage does not contain *solidorum*; and Baronius discusses the use

out with great clearness by Mommsen in his History of Roman Coinage, *Histoire de la Monnaie Romaine* (tr. Blacas), III, p. 156, "Nous savons positivement que sous le règne de Constantin tous les payements en monnaie d'or se faisaient au poids et d'autre part qu'on acceptait en payement et au poids les lingots d'or régulièrement contrôlés." He then refers to an edict of Constantine's of the year 325 (*Cod. Theod.* XII, 71, 1 with XII, 6, 2), given in brief in *Cod. Just.* X 71, 1, "Si quis solidos appendere voluerit auri cocti, septem (corr. sex) solidos quaternorum scrupulorum nostris uultibus figuratos appendat per singulas uncias . . . eadem ratione seruanda et si materiam quis inferat ut solidos dedisse uideatur." The effectual administration of this system involved the appointment of special officials in the chief places in the empire and the striking of a standard weight. These officials were called *ponderatores*, *spectatores* or *zygostatae* (*ζυγοστάται*), and it was their business to settle all disputes relating to the weight and goodness of *solidi* (Mommsen, *I. c. Cod. Just.* X 71, 2, "quotiens de qualitate solidorum orta fuerit dubitatio placet quem sermo Graecus zygostatem appellat per singulas ciuitates institutum qui pro sua fide atque industria neque fallat neque fallatur contentionem dirimere," an edict of Julian's of July, 363). The standard weights were struck in brass, often with silver letters in relief, and were called *exagia solidi*. The object of these *exagia* is given in a passage quoted by Eckhel, *Doctrina numorum ueterum*, VIII, p. 512, from an edict of Theodosius II and Valentinian III (Nov. 25), "de ponderibus quoque ut fraus penitus amputetur, a nobis aguntur exagia quae sub interminata superius comprehensa sine fraude debeant custodiri." Eckhel gives three examples of *exagia*, one of a bearded Honorius hardly earlier than A. D. 400. Other specimens are described in Mommsen, C. I. L. III 6635 (A. D. 474), VIII 3294, and several in V 8119. See also a recent paper in the *Zeitschrift für Numismatik*, XI, p. 56 sqq. (abstracted in the *Revue des Revues*, 1884, p. 159).

Having now approximately determined the date of the Latin *exagium*, we must do the same by the Greek *ἐξάγιον* or *ἐξάριον*. As a rule, the passages for which it is quoted are from Byzantine writers, such as Photius, patriarch, A. D. 858, Zonaras

of *libra* in it, *Annales*, 3, 330. Dr. Hort tells me that the *Acta* of the (mythical) Synod of Sinuessa (see *Dict. Christ. Biography* III 805^b) are supposed to be forgeries of the 6th century.

(16, 203)¹, Balsamo, and the like. But there are some instances which seem to claim an earlier date. The first one is in the treatise *περὶ εὐπορίστων ἀπλῶν τε καὶ συνθέτων φαρμάκων* (on easily accessible remedies, simple and compound), attributed to Dioscorides, II, ch. 63 (Kühn, Vol. 2, p. 276), *ἄγνου σπέρματος ἔξαγιον*, in the sense of $\frac{1}{6}$ of 1 oz. The date of Dioscorides is uncertain; but he is not later than the second century A. D., so that if the treatise were his, *ἔξαγιον* would be documentarily much older than *exagium*. But its Greek is unmistakably Byzantine; and Kühn is evidently right in classing it among the many spurious works which have been attributed to this physician. *στάγιον*, another form of the word, which I shall discuss below, appears in the collection of tables of weights and measures included amongst the works of Galen (Kühn, Vol. 19, p. 763, Hultsch, Metrologicorum scriptorum reliquiae, I §§51-66). Hultsch, however (Prolegomena, §§50, etc.), shows that even the earliest form of these tables does not date from further back than the beginning of the 5th century. Besides, throughout the genuine works of Galen we hear nothing of the *ἔξαγιον*. The derivative *ἔξαγιάζω*, to settle the standard weight of anything, is found in the Liber Geponicus of Heron, §201 (Hultsch, Heronis Alexandrini geometricorum et stereometricorum reliquiae). The writer is speaking of the weight of a cubic foot of various substances, such as barley, wine, bacon, and he proceeds *ταῦτα δὲ ἔξαγιάσθησαν ἐπὶ Μοδέστου τηνικαῦτα ὄντος ἵπαρχου πραιτωρίου*, 'and these standards were fixed when Modestus was praefect of the praetorian guard.' No one, of course, can suppose that this passage was written by Heron of Alexandria! But though its exact date is uncertain, it is convicted of being late Greek by the unaugmented condition of *ἔξαγιάσθησαν*² (compare Sophocles, Preface to Greek Lexicon, p. 37)

¹ The passage of Zonaras is interesting from its recording a temporary depreciation of the *solidus* by Nicephorus Phocas: *ὅν δὲ πρὸς τοῖς ἀλλοις καὶ χρημάτων ἥπτων μέχρι γὰρ ἑκείνου παντὸς νομίσματος ἔξαγιον σταθμὸν ἐλκοντος ἑκείνος τὸ τεταρτηρὸν ἐπενόησεν κ. τ. λ.*

² The non-addition of the augment may be and perhaps is due to a sense of the alien origin of the word, which might indeed have been formed directly from the Latin. But then *cadit quæstio*. It is perhaps too bold to conjecture *ἴσταγιάσθησαν* (see below). One must bestow a passing caution on the reader of the article *ἴσαγιάζω* in Sophocles. Sophocles first misprints the word (*ἴξ.*), and then mistranslates it: 'to measure by *ἔξαγια*': as if cubic feet of wine, etc., would be measured by small fractions of one ounce! He calls the writer of the passage *Heron junior*, and assigns him doubtfully to A. D. 700—a date which shows his opinion of his Greek. But I cannot conceive where he

and by the use of ὑπάρχος for *praefectus* instead of the usual Greek term ἐπαρχος.¹ This Modestus was probably the Fl. Domitius.

gets the name from, as he quotes him from Hultsch's 'Heronis Alexandrini relliquiae.' It is to be regretted that Hultsch has not gone more thoroughly into the question of the authenticity of the liber Geponicus.

¹ I cannot find any sufficient warrant for the statement of Valesius on Euseb. Vita Const. IV 1 init. (p. 239), "parum refert ἐπάρχοντι dixeris an ὑπάρχοντι," if the statement is to be taken generally. In Plutarch, Agesilaus (I 603 D, c. 14, ed. Frankfort), ὑπάρχοι simply means 'subordinates.' In his Cicero, c. 32, I 877 A, τεκτόνων ὑπάρχος is read, it is true, in the sense of *praefectus fabrum*; but Wytténbach (Index, s. v.) is undoubtedly right in correcting ἐπαρχος from c. 26, 880 B. In Galba, c. 2, 1053 E, we have Νυμφίδιος Σαβίνος ὁν ἐπαρχος τῆς αὐλῆς, in c. 8, 1056 B, ἐπαρχος simply, and in 13, 1058 A, τῆς αὐλῆς καὶ δορυφόρων ἐπαρχος. Out of the numerous passages cited by Wytténbach (l. c.) from Aristides, I have not been able to find one where ὑπάρχος is used in any other sense than that of σατράπης. Herodian uses ἐπαρχος (1, 9, 10), and more commonly ἐπάρχον (3, 10, 5; 3, 13, 1; 4, 12, 1) for the *praefectus praetorio*. Similarly for the *praefectus urbi*, ἐπαρχος (2, 6, 8), ἐπάρχον (2, 2, 7; 7, 7, 4; 8, 8, 4) with τῆς πόλεως or τῆς Ῥωμαίων πόλεως. Dion Cassius is consistent in his use of ἐπαρχος for the *praefectus praetorio*. In 55, 10 he says this usage is established, τότε δὲ πρώτον καὶ ἐπάρχοντις τῶν δορυφόρων δύο ἀπέθειζεν οὐτω γάρ τοι αὐτοῖς μόνοις τῶν ἐπαρχόντων τινὸς ἐπειδή περ ἐκ νένικη εν ὄνομάζω; and in 52, 24 we have ἐπαρχος opposed to ὑπάρχος, τῶν δ' ἄλλων τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰταλίᾳ στρατιῶν οἱ ἐπαρχοι ἔκεινοι προστατεύονται ὑπάρχοντις ἔχοντες. He translates *praefectura* by ἐπαρχικὴ ἔξουσία, 75, 14. He uses ὑπάρχος, on the other hand, with ὑποστράτηγος, 36, 20. Comp. ἐν ὑπάρχον μέρει, 36, 2. It represents a subordinate generally (compare Lucian, Dial. 12, 2 of Hannibal, ὑπάρχος ὡν τῷ ἀδελφῷ), and is sometimes used to translate the Lat. *legatus*; other exx. 36, 19; 38, 35; 39, 39; 69, 13; and of the verb ὑπάρχω, 36, 19; 71, 34. (For *praefectus urbi* he uses πολιαρχος, 52, 21; 54, 17; 78, 14.) The evidence of inscriptions tends the same way. Thus in Boeckh, C. I. 4483, ἐπαρχος τοῦ λεροῦ πραιτωρίου, A. D. 244; 6627, πιστευθέντι τὰ τῶν ἐπάρχων τοῦ Πραιτωρίου καὶ Ῥώμης, and in the Latin, uice *praefectorum* pr(aetorio) et urbi functo of Sex. Varius Marcellus, the father of Elagabalus; so ἐπάρχων πραιτωρίων, 2593 (before 371), cf. 2596 (about 382), ἐπαρχος Ῥώμης, 369 (about A. D. 66), ἐπ. τῆς πόλεως τῆς Ῥωμίων, 2587 (about 50), cf. 2594 and 2595 (about 382). Compare ὁ ἐνδοξώτατος (*sic!*) ἐπαρχος τῆς πόλεως, Mittheilungen des deutsch. Instit. zu Athen IV, 307. Also ἐπαρχος ἑραρίου στρατιωτικοῦ (about A. D. 244), ἐπ. αἰραρίου, 4033 and 4034 (about 163). ἐπαρχος Λιγύπτου occurs several times. Also ἐπ. εἰλῆς etc. (*praefectus alae*), λεγεᾶνος, etc. But there is no early example of ὑπάρχος. 2592 (where it is used for *praefectus praetorio Illyrici*) is after Constantine; compare below, 8614a, where the Latin has *praef. urb.* is to be assigned to A. D. 406; ὑπ. πραιτωρίων, 8712, occurs on a Christian inscription of about 1071 A. D. The remaining instances are of uncertain date and antiquity, 373b, 1080 A of a certain Plutarchus ἐκ γενεῆς περίβωτον ἀπ' ἀνθυπάτων καὶ ὑπάρχων, 4461a. Du Cange, in his Graeco-Latin Glossary, gives ὑπ. and ἐπ. as alternative forms in ἐπαρχος and several of its derivatives. But ἐπαρχος still seems to be in the

Modestus, who was appointed Praetorian Praefect (*τῆς αὐλῆς ὑπαρχος*) by Valens at the end of A. D. 369 (Zosimus, IV 11 fin.). See on him Sievers' Libanius, 227-334.

To sum up the chronological argument, we have no certain example of the Greek words occurring till the 9th century A. D., whereas the Latin is certainly as old as 372 A. D., and in all probability at least 60 years older.

Chronology having now shown us that the Latin *exagium* cannot have been derived from *ἐξάγιον*, we are left to deal with the convers-hypothesis. The meanings of the Greek and Latin words run together a certain way; and then the Greek diverges. We saw that the Latin meant (1) weighing or testing by a standard, and then (2) the standard weight. We find this in Greek also, in the gloss of Philoxenus *ἐξάγιον* *pensatio*, and in the lemma to an extract from the rustic writer Florentinus, in the Geponica, 2, 32.¹ It runs Περὶ σίτου δοκιμασίας καὶ πῶς χρὴ τὸ ἐξάγιον τῶν ἄρτων ποιεῖσθαι, an exact translation of the *exagium facere* already quoted. Du Cange (s. v. *exagium*) quotes a Latin-Greek gloss which agrees exactly with this expression for determining whether the weight of a loaf agreed with the standard: *exagies*,² *ἄρτῳ ἐντυπή, panis subactio* (Cuiacianus). In Suidas, s. v. *στατήρ*, it is doubtful whether it means *pondus* or *ponderatio*. As already seen, *exagium* has a special reference to the *solidus*, and the same is the case with *ἐξάγιον*. The Greek population of the Eastern Empire did not adopt the Latin word *solidus*, but called weight

ascendant, and has a good majority of the instances quoted. Remarks like 'ἐπαρχος and ὑπαρχος promiscue pro praefectis praetorio et urbis a scriptoribus usurpantur' and 'ἐπαρχος vel ὑπ. τοῦ Πραιτωρίου de qua dignitate passim scriptores' are of little value to modern scholars. The earliest example of ὑπαρχος that I have been able to find is in an address of welcome to Anatolius, who was *praefectus Illyrici* in A. D. 349, by the rhetorician Himerius, Eclog. 32, 3, θῆρα γέγονε τῆς ἡμετέρας τέχνης ὁ μέγας ἐπαρχος. [ὑπαρχος πόλεως, ὑπαρχος Galen de praenotione Kühn XIV 612 should be corrected.] The introduction of ὑπαρχος as an equivalent for *praefectus praetorio* probably dates from the time when Constantine converted the praetorian praefects from military to civil functionaries, and apportioned amongst them the ordinary administration of the four great provinces into which he then divided the empire. ὑπαρχος, a 'governor under the emperor,' would then be felt to be a more natural term than ἐπαρχος, a 'commander.'

¹ Florentinus wrote under Alexander Severus. But the Geponica was compiled by Cassianus Bassus at the command of Constantine Porphyrogenitus.

² The form of the word is uncertain.

and coin alike, either generally *νόμισμα*, *the coin*, or more specially *ἔξαγιον*, *ἔξαγιον* or *στάγιον* (see Hultsch, Metrologie, p. 327),¹ and this latter gradually came to be used as a regular apothecaries' weight.

We next come to the form of the word. It was *ἔξαγιον* when first borrowed; but the freaky spirit of popular etymology could not long resist the united attractions of the form *ξ* and the meaning *sextula*, and *ἔξαγιον* was the result. J. N. Niclas, the editor of the Geponica,² wishes to distinguish between the forms. 'If, he says, it means a *nummus* or *pondus definitum*, the rough breathing is to be used (*ε* densandum est); but with the meaning of weighing (librationis) and when used for any weight, we should use the smooth breathing (tenuandum).' But the facts do not bear out his distinction. *ἔξαγιον* is more frequent in texts than *ἔξαγιον*; and that is all. The apparent rarity of the aspirated form seems due to a curious and interesting circumstance. As is well known, the Greeks denoted numerals by the letters of their ancient alphabet, thus: *α'*, *β'*, *γ'*. The sixth letter was the *F* or Wau, retained in the form of the Latin F. This was written in later Greek in a form which led to its confusion with the abbreviation of *στ* (*cr*), *i. e.* *ς*. Thus *ἔξαγιον* appeared as *ςάγιον*, and was confused with *στάγιον*. The question arises: was this *στάγιον* pronounced *ἔξαγιον* or not? Scaliger, in his treatise *de re numaria*, p. 54, is of opinion that it was. But I am inclined to think that he is wrong. For in the Metrologici Scriptores we have §67, 21, *τὸ στάγιον ἔχει ἔξαγιον α'*, which should be compared with *id.* 13, *τὸ μεγάλητρον ἔχει οὐγγίαν α'*, and §58, 20, *τὸ δηνάριον στάγιον ἔν*. It seems incredible that the compiler of the tables should have meant that "a *ἔξαγιον* is an *ἔξαγιον*," or, as the Greek idiom puts it, contains one *ἔξαγιον*. I conclude then that here also we have an instance where a new word has been produced by the misunderstanding of an abbreviation.

We may now finally discard *ἔξαγιον* and company and return once more to *exagium*. Its derivation is not far to seek. A superficial treatment is to say that it is from *ex* and *ago*. But if this means that it is formed from the verbal compound, we must observe first that this does not agree with the existing form, which should be **exiguum* like *obsidium* by *sedere*, *imperium*, *beneficium*; and secondly, that the use of *exigere* for testing seems to have had

¹ The familiar *δηνάριον* was also used in this sense; cf. Hultsch, Metrol. Script. I, p. 98, and the passage quoted below. We naturally think of our 'pennyweight.'

² *Ad l. c.*

an intellectual, not a physical origin. From 'requiring' or 'exacting' a piece of work from a person, we get it used with reference to the standard by which a performance is judged. Thus "ad perpendiculum exigere columnas," Cic. Verr. 2, 1, §133, is properly 'to require columnas in accordance with the perpendicular line,' and thence to 'test' them by that line; "omnia argumenta ad obrussam exigere," Sen., N. Q. 4, 5, 1, is to require them to conform to the touchstone, to test them by it. It has already been noted that the original sense of *ag-*, to move, produced *exa(g)men*, the moving tongue of the balance; and that the application to weight was still before the popular consciousness is shown by *agina*,¹ the place where this movement took place, "the socket or eye to which the beam of a balance is pinned and in which the upright index (*examen, ligula*) oscillates to show that the object weighed corresponds exactly with the weight in the opposite scale" (Rich, Dict. of Antiquities, s. v.); Tertull. Pudic. 41, Paul Fest. 10, 3, "quo inseritur scapus trutinae, id est in quo foramine trutina se uertit," Placidus, Gl. 9, 8. The verb *aginare* (or *aginari*) is found in a gloss, Gl. Labb., *aginal διαπράσσεται, στρέφει, μηχανᾶται*. It is explained in the "glosses of Isidore" as *tricari, in paruo morari*, to haggle about trifles (Löwe, Prodromus Lat. Gloss., p. 427), and on the same page Löwe quotes "aginantes, explicantes," for which Prof. Nettleship conjectures "aginantes, tricantes." It has also been restored in Petronius, 61, 9 B², in the sense of 'making one's way rapidly.' Further we get the verbal substantive *aginator* explained by Paulus *I. c.* as "qui paruo lucro mouetur," and by Placidus, Gl. 9, 12, "aginatorem, negotiatorem actus," for which Prof. Nettleship suggests "aginator, negotiator exactus." It seems to have been a semi-contemptuous term for a tradesman in a small way, who always looked to the turn of the balance, a haggler, petty huckster. The correlation of *exagmen*, the moving tongue of the balance, *agina*, the place where it moved, and the root *ag*, to move, is unmistakable. *Ex-ag-iu-m* has an exact parallel in

¹ The quantity of the *i* is doubtful. Prof. Nettleship, Journal of Philology, XI, p. 99, gives it short on the analogy of *sarc-ina*, *pag-ina*, and *ang-ina*; and he may be right. I incline, however, to think that it contains the suffix *-ina* which was originally verbal (*rūpina, ruīna*) and corresponded to our *-ing*, and then came to denote the *place* where an action took place or the material *substance* produced by or essential to it. Examples of the first class are *opificina*, *vāgina*, *salīnae*, salt-diggings, *popina*, and several others; of the second, *sāgina* (in formation exactly parallel to *āgina*), *pruīna*, *urīna*.

ad-ag-iu-m,¹ which is connected with *aio* (for *a(g)io*), the root being that of *axamenta*, *indigitamenta*. I regard it as a new formation of the 4th century to express the act of weighing, whose form was determined by the above quoted words in *ag-*. I cannot allow that it was formed from *exigo*, or that it is a *re-formation* of an **exigium*, although such "recompositions," as Seelmann (Aussprache des Lat.) calls them, are common in the later Latin; and *exigo* was itself so treated, as is shown by the gloss *exago*, ἔξελανω. I am, however, willing to admit that *exigo* may have co-operated with *examen* to decide the form of the word.

A very curious word which, if genuine, must be connected with *exagium*, appears in Ennodius, de Epiphanii Ticinensis Episcopi Vita (Hartel, p. 380), "ninguido aere et quali solent homines ad tecta confugere Rauennam egressus est et per omnes Aemiliae ciuitates celer uenit tamquam ad sepulchri receptaculum properans, omnibus sacerdotibus in itinere positis munificus, communis, affabilis et, quasi *exagellam* (Brussels MS *exagellia*) relinquens, se ipso praestantior." If the reading is right, it would seem to mean 'leaving a standard or pattern piece to posterity.'²

I do not propose to follow the word through medieval Latin or Romance. But the following examples from Du Cange may be quoted: *exagium facere* (*exagium 2*) is used of the *Iudicium Dei* in an old document among the archives of Marseilles, A. D. 850; and in a document of Richerus, Bishop of Verdun, A. D. 1099, it is distinguished from *pondus*, "coram camerario tam de pondere quam de *exagio*, hoc est de metalli sinceritate ritu faciat." It is perhaps hardly necessary to say that it has nothing to do with another *exagium* (No. 3), which Du Cange identifies with *exagum* in the sense of *produce* (*exitus*).

J. P. POSTGATE.

¹ That is to say, exact if the second *a* of *adagium* is short. For the quantity of *exagium* we have a couplet quoted by Du Cange (ed. Le Favre), *s. v.* "exágium solido differt a nomine solo, si solidum quaeres, tres dragmas dimidiatis." According to Osthoff, *Perf.* pp. 174-6, following Curt. *Stud.* IX 463, and G. Meyer, *Griech. Gramm.* §§280, 484, the *ag* of *adagium* is long, or it would have become *ig*, as in *prodigus*. This must be admitted if analogies like that of *suffrágium* are decisive. But it must also be pointed out that *adagium* may be a 'popular Latin' formation, and that in such we find *a* where we should not expect it, as in *cáballus*.

² F. Vogel, however, in Wölfflin's *Archiv*, I, p. 270 n., regards it as corrupt.

IV.—THE ΜΑΣΤΡΟΙ AT RHODES.

In several Rhodian inscriptions mention is made of a board of officers called *μαστροί*, and from these inscriptions our chief information in regard to them must be derived. It may, however, be well first to collect what information is to be derived from other sources.

In the great inscription from Andania¹ relating to the mysteries in the section περὶ τῶν διαφόρων, line 51 we read καὶ ἀριθμησάντω παραχρῆμα τῷ ταμίᾳ, καὶ ἔστωσαν ὑπόμαστροι, ἂν τι εὐρίσκωνται ἀδικοῦντες, διπλασίους καὶ ἐπιτιμίους [δραχ]μῶν χ[ι]λιᾶν, καὶ οἱ δικαστ[αὶ μ.]ὴ ἀφαιρούντω μηθέν and again, line 60 καὶ ἀποδόντω γραφὰν τῷ ἐπιμελητῷ περὶ δυνατῶν καὶ διοικήσωντι, καὶ ἔστωσαν ὑπόμαστροι, ἂν τι ἀδικήσωντι, καθὼς ἐπάνω γέγραπται. In both these cases *ὑπόμαστρος* is nearly equivalent to *ὑπόδικος*, which occurs in the section headed ἀδικημάτων, line 80 ἂν δὲ μὴ ἐκτίνει παραχρῆμα, παραδότω δέ κύριος τὸν οἰκέταν τῷ ἀδικηθέντι εἰς ἀπεργασίαν, εἰ δὲ μή, ὑπόδικος ἔστω ποτὲ διπλοῦν, except that in the first two cases the judgment seems to have rested entirely with the *μαστροί*, while in the last case, that of an *ἀδίκημα*, the regular courts had authority. Some such distinction seems to be referred to by the words above cited, καὶ οἱ δικασταὶ μὴ ἀφαιρούντω μηθέν.

Μαστροί are mentioned also in a decree of the city of Delphi² regulating the employment of a sum of money presented to the city by Attalos II to be used for the payment of teachers' salaries and for the maintenance of certain sacrifices. It is decreed that this money shall be sacred to the god, and shall be used only for the purposes stated (l. 17 sqq.) Then follow (l. 20 sqq.) the words εἰ δέ τις τούτων τι ποιήσαι ἡ ἀρχῶν ἡ ἴδιώτας κατάμαστρος ἔστω ιερῶν χρημάτων φορᾶς καὶ οἱ μαστροὶ καταγραφόντω κατ' αὐτὸν κατὰ τὸ ψαφισθέν κ. τ. λ. Here, as at Andania, the *μαστροί* are evidently a board having jurisdiction over offences, or at least some offences, coming under the general head of sacrilege, inasmuch as the money in question is consecrated to the god.

Some information is also supplied by Harpocration s. v. *μαστῆρες*. ‘Υπερίδης ἐν τῷ πρὸς Πάγκαλον. ἔοικεν ἀρχή τις εἶναι ἀποδεδειγμένη

¹ Lebas-Foucart, II, p. 162 n. 326a, Cauer delectus. Ed. II, n. 47.

² Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique, V, p. 157.

ἐπὶ τὸ ζητεῖν τὰ κοινὰ τοῦ δήμου, ὡς οἱ ζητηταὶ καὶ οἱ ἐν Πελλήνῃ μαστροί, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ Πελληνέων πολιτείᾳ. Whether the *ζητηταὶ* at Athens were a permanent board or not, is somewhat doubtful. A board of *ζητηταὶ* was constituted to investigate the mutilation of the *Hermæ*,¹ and on certain other occasions.² Of the *μαστροί* at Pellene nothing further is known.

From the words of Hesychius *μαστρίαι* * *ai τῶν ἀρχόντων εὑθυναι* it appears that the *μαστροί* had somewhere the direction of investigations into the conduct of officers of state and the auditing of their accounts. Indeed, one is tempted to apply this to Rhodes when one reads s. v. *μάστροι* * *παρὰ Ροδίοις βουλευτῆρες*. There is, however, nothing in the inscriptions to justify us in so doing, and the second definition of Hesychius just cited appears to contain some corruption or mistake, for the senate of Rhodes is uniformly called *βουλή*, and it is highly improbable that the members of the *βουλή* should have been called *μαστροί*. *Βουλευτῆρες*, however, can be nothing else than *βουλευταί*, i. e. members of the *βουλή*.

In the year 406 B. C. the Rhodians, who had up to that time inhabited the three cities of Ialysus, Lindus and Camirus, united in founding the new city of Rhodes,³ and after this time the three older cities cease to figure as independent communities. They preserved, however, a certain degree of individuality, and published decrees, a number of which have been preserved. It is in these decrees that the *μαστροί* are mentioned. The headings of four such decrees seem to me to be instructive. They are as follows:

"Ἐδοξε μαστροῖς καὶ Δινδίοις ἐπιστατῶν γνώμα."⁴

Καὶ μαστροὶ καὶ Δινδῖοι:⁵

"Ἐδοξε τοῖς μαστροῖς καὶ Ιαλυσίοι[ς]:"⁶

"Ἐδοξε μαστροῖς καὶ Δινδίοις ἐπιστατῶν [γνώμα]:"⁷

In all these cases "the *μαστροί* precede the name of the people who enact the decree, occupying the place usually assigned to the *βουλή* in Greek decrees."⁸ The usual formula for the headings of Greek decrees is *ἔδοξε τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ*, and if in the instances

¹ Andoc. de mysteriis 14, 36; 40, 65.

² Demosth. 696, 9; 703, II. Cf. Lysias, Or. 21, §16.

³ Diod. Sic. XIII 75.

⁴ Ross, Hellenica, p. 114, n. 47, vs. 4.

⁵ Ross, Rhein. Mus. 1846, p. 196 (Arch. Aufs. II, p. 615, n. 26), vs. 1.

⁶ Newton, Ancient Greek Inscr. in the Brit. Mus. II 349, vs. 1.

⁷ Newton, Ancient Greek Inscr. in the Brit. Mus. II 357, vs. 1. Cf. also vs. 42 sq. *δεδόχθαι τοῖς μαστροῖς καὶ Δινδίοις*.

⁸ Newton, Anc. Gr. Inscr. in Brit. M. II ad n. 351, p. 126.

above cited we read δῆμος for Δινδίους or Ἰαλυσίους we should have the usual formula with the *μαστροὶ* substituted for the βουλή. But the use of the name of a people instead of δῆμος is, to say the least, very remarkable. If we wish to say "the senate (or *μαστροὶ*) and people of the Lindians (or Ialyssians)" we must say, not *μαστροὶ καὶ Δινδίους* (*Ἰαλυσίους*), but Δινδίων (*Ἰαλυσίων*) *μαστροὶ καὶ δῆμος*. The particle *καὶ* regularly interposed between the *μαστροὶ*, and the name of the people joined with them in issuing the decree, shows that the *μαστροὶ* are one thing, and the Lindians or Ialyssians another. The Lindians, Ialyssians and Camireans were not independent peoples with fully developed political constitutions, but mere parts of the whole people of Rhodes (δ σύμπας δῆμος, Ross, Rhein. Mus. 1846, p. 194, vs. 7). For the regulation of their local affairs, or at least of local affairs pertaining to the gods and their temples, these divisions of the Rhodian people were not subdivided into senates and popular assemblies, but acted as units, and with them were associated a board of *μαστροὶ* appointed or elected by the entire people. This is the only hypothesis which satisfactorily explains the peculiar headings of their decrees. It might seem, however, from one inscription,¹ that the *μαστροὶ* were elected by the *κτοῖναι*, which were subdivisions of the population or territory of the Rhodian towns. The inscription in question contains a decree of the Camireans ordering that their *κτοῖναι* be inscribed on a marble stelè and set up in the Hieron of Athena. The manner in which this shall be done is described, after which the decree goes on (l. 13) ἐγ̄ δὲ ταῦταν τὰν κτοῖναν ἀποδεικνύειν τοὺς κτοῖνάτας μαστρὸν ἐν τῷ ιερῷ τῷ ἀγιωτάτῳ ἐν τῷ κτοῖνᾳ κατὰ τὸν νύμον τὸν τῶν Ῥοδίων, τοῦτο δὲ συνλεγέσθων ἐν Καμίρῳ εἰς τὸ ιερὸν τᾶς Ἀθαναίας ὅκκα τοὺς ιεροποιοὺς παραγένοντες καὶ ἀθρεόντω τὰ ιερὰ τὰ Καμιρέων [τὰ δαμο] τελῆ. The last word seems to me tolerably certain, though Mr. Newton prints it with a question mark. Exactly what the *κτοῖναι* were, is uncertain. M. Martha² compares them with the Attic demes. At any rate, they were small territorial divisions. The members of these *κτοῖναι* are to appoint a *μαστρός*, apparently one from each *κτοῖνα*, who are to inspect the sacred rites of the Camireans.³ But the expression ἀποδεικνύειν μαστρὸν may very well refer to appointing some one of an already organized board to undertake these duties, and does not oblige us to suppose that the *μαστροὶ* were previously elected

¹ Anc. Gr. Inscr. in Brit. Mus. II 351, with Newton's commentary.

² Bull. de Corr. Hell. IV, p. 144.

³ Cf. Newton, l. c. p. 126, who very properly refers τοῦτο to the *μαστροὶ*.

by the *κτοῖναι*, or were special officers of the several towns rather than of the whole state. We find the *μαστροί* here in conjunction with the *ἱεροποοί* engaged in business connected with sacred rites, which is quite in accordance with what we have found to be their office in other places. The same is the case wherever the *μαστροί* are mentioned in Rhodian inscriptions¹ as far as can be determined. In one inscription² the *μαστροί* and the Lindians confer a crown upon a public official for *piety toward the goddess* and goodwill toward the Lindians; in another the *γραμματεὺς μαστρῶν*³ has formerly been priest of Athena Lindia, Zeus Polieus and Artemis Kekoia. From the fact that a person who had formerly held such priestly offices became clerk of the *μαστροί*, we may infer that the *μαστροί* were religious functionaries, and also, perhaps, that the office of clerk was one of some importance.

Before leaving the subject of Rhodian inscriptions, I venture to propose what seems to me a correction of Mr. Newton's reading of the first line of the inscription published by him in the Ancient Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum, II, No. 343. The beginning of the inscription is broken away, leaving a space sufficient for six letters. Mr. Newton proposes to read '*Ἐπὶ ναυ]άρχου Νικομήδους*'. Now the Nauarch is nowhere found as eponymous magistrate at Rhodes, and Mr. Newton defends this reading by calling attention to the fact that the inscription deals throughout with naval affairs. But is that a sufficient reason for employing the Nauarch as eponymus? Elsewhere the eponymus is without exception the priest (of Apollo), and the inscriptions are dated, if at all, *ἐπὶ τερέως τοῦ δεῖνος*, except that sometimes they are dated (as are for instance several of the pieces of Rhodian pottery published by *Νέροντος* in the '*Ἀθῆναιον*', III (1874, pp. 213-245), for the sake of brevity simply *ἐπὶ τοῦ δεῖνος*). Is that not the case here? If so, we should complete the first word to form a proper name, as for instance '*Ἐπὶ Νικ]άρχου*', and consider *Νικομήδους* the name of the father of the eponymus.

HAROLD N. FOWLER.

¹ To those already cited may be added Ross, *Inscript. Ined.* 271, *Rhein. Mus.* 1846, p. 182 (=Ross, *Arch. Aufs.* II 604), and *Anc. Inscr. in Brit. Mus.* II 353.

² *Rhein. Mus.* 1846, p. 196.

³ *Rhein. Mus.* 1846, p. 182. Also mentioned *Anc. Inscr. in Brit. Mus.* II 353, l. 8; Ross, *Hellenika*, p. 115 C, l. 7.

V.—A LATIN POETICAL IDIOM IN OLD ENGLISH.

There is a poetical use of the Old English noun *laf* which deserves more attention than has yet been bestowed upon it. In the idiom referred to it occurs in conjunction with a dependent genitive (usually plural and prepositive) in the sense of 'that which has escaped from,' or 'that which has been formed or fashioned by' some object or objects. For our purpose it is important to distinguish these two senses of *laf*. In the former case the noun in the genitive denotes a weapon, or some dangerous or terrible object; in the latter it denotes some tool or instrumentality employed in artistic production. The phrases under consideration may accordingly be divided into two classes, designated as class A and class B.

Class A includes: *sweorda lafe*, Beow. 2937; *lafe lagosfōa*, Gen. 1343; *wrd̄dra lafe*, Gen. 1496; *wætra lafe*, Gen. 1549; *wēpna ldf(e)*, Gen. 2005, Dan. 74; *gdra ldf*, Gen. 2019; *swōles lafe*, Phœn. 269; *ddes lafe*, Phœn. 272; *fȳres lafe*, Phœn. 276; *darepa ldf*, Brunanb. 54. To these may be added the compounds *wéalaf(e)*, Beow. 1084, 1098, Met 1²³; *yöldfe*, Beow. 566, Exod. 585, An. 499; *egeldfe* (MS *ece lafe*), Exod. 370; *sälufe*, Exod. 584.

Class B includes: *homera lafe*, Beow. 2829, Riddle 6⁷; *hamora ldfum*, Brunanb. 6; *fēla lafe* (MS *laf*), Beow. 1032, *fēole ldf*, Riddle 70⁸; *fȳres ldf*, Riddle 70⁹. *Lafe*, Riddle 57¹⁰, does not admit of being classified with any certainty, because of the mutilation of the probable genitive.

This use of the word appears to be peculiar to Old English among the Germanic dialects. Is it, therefore, absolutely singular and anomalous? The affirmative cannot be maintained, since a similar construction occurs in the most popular of Latin poets, and in the accepted model of prose Latinity. That these authors were known by English scholars of the 7th and 8th centuries, and that the style of Virgil was imitated by the Anglo-Latin poets of that period, requires no further proof than the explicit statements of Wright (*Biographia Britannica Literaria*, Anglo-Saxon Period, pp. 37-42). If Virgil was thus imitated by the Anglo-Latin poets, is it unlikely that a Virgilian idiom might find its way into Old

English poetry? No portion of Virgil has been more universally read and studied than the beginning of the Aeneid, and it is precisely there (Aen. I 30) that the phrase *reliquias Danaum* occurs. But, again, this is not an isolated occurrence, since it is also found I 598 and III 87. The *reliquias Danaum* is precisely the Old English idiom in respect to form and sense. What hinders us from assuming, then, that it is the original of this idiom? It may be answered that the phrase is somewhat strained and unnatural. To this Wright replies: "They chose, in preference to all others, those expressions, or words, or uses of words, which ought not to be imitated, being exceptions to rules . . . ; and these expressions, because they were strange and uncommon, they repeated over and over again with lavish profusion . . . The early Anglo-Latin poets delighted in nothing more than ingenious conceits, enigmatical expressions." But again it may be objected that the Virgilian phrase is palpably a Grecism, and suggested by Aeschylus, Agam. 517:

στρατὸν δέχεσθαι τὸν λελειμμένον δορός.

"The army to receive, the war-spear's leavings."

If a Grecism, it is at all events one which has the sanction of Cicero (De Senectute, 6, 19): "quam palmam utinam di inmortales, Scipio, tibi reservent, ut *avi reliquias* persequare." Admitting it to be a Grecism, however, our assumption is not invalidated. Wright continues: "The narrow partiality of Theodore, Adrian, and their scholars, for the study of Greek, had given a wrong turn to their literary taste; and this appears in the multitude of Greek words and expressions which they grafted upon the Latin language."

It is somewhat remarkable that three of the phrases in class A are found in the Phœnix within a compass of eight lines. The Latin poem on which the Old English Phœnix is based is usually ascribed to Lactantius, the "Christian Cicero," so-called because of his assiduous study of the Roman classic, and of the finish which he thus succeeded in imparting to his style. Ten Brink (with Dieterich, Gäßler, and Wülcker), assigns the composition of the Old English Phœnix to Cynewulf (Early English Literature, p. 56): "The rendering of the Latin poem of the Phœnix, from its relation to the resurrection, belongs to the same class . . . The elegance and precision of expression, characteristic of this poem, are necessarily impaired in Cynewulf's

unevenly diffuse treatment." Furthermore, Cynewulf was in some sense a disciple of Aldhelm; Ten Brink (Early Eng. Lit. p. 51) declares: "Aldhelm's example had great influence, perhaps in certain things a decisive influence upon Cynewulf . . . Cynewulf borrowed many of his themes from Aldhelm." Concerning Aldhelm we are told by Wright (p. 45): "He was a great imitator of the ancients; he was a celebrated Greek scholar, and he filled his writings with foreign words and clumsy compounds; he was also a lover and composer of Anglo-Saxon verse."

The *catena* of arguments, so far as relates to the Phoenix, is therefore as follows: The Latin original is to be assigned to the period, and perhaps to the pen of Lactantius, a close student of Cicero, in whom the phrase *avi reliquias* occurs; the Old English poem of the Phoenix is the production of Cynewulf, who wrote under the influence of Aldhelm, an author of Old English as well as Latin verse; Aldhelm is known to have quoted and imitated Virgil, and would be more likely than not to imitate his Grecisms, esteeming them beauties rather than blemishes; Cynewulf himself must have been a Latin scholar, and therefore, no doubt acquainted with the Virgilian phrase in question, and, as a student of Lactantius, *perhaps* acquainted with the Ciceronian phrase; hence there is no intrinsic improbability in the assumption that *swoles lufe, ddes lufe* and *fýres lufe*, Phœn. 269, 272, 276, are imitated from the Latinity of Virgil and Cicero. It must be admitted that nothing similar to this phrase appears in the Latin original of this particular passage, which has only

"Quicquid de corpore restat,
Ossaque vel cineres exuviasque suas";

but this circumstance is of comparatively slight moment.

How then, it may be asked, is the occurrence of the idiom in the other poems to be accounted for? It is well known that the epic phraseology was largely conventional and traditional; hence the popularity of the Phœnix might explain why similar expressions are found in the battle of Brunanburh and the Metres of Boethius. As for Beowulf, Genesis, Exodus and Daniel, the phrases were either added in a late redaction, or the idiom was familiar to the scholars who first reduced them to writing, and who must have known something of Latin, and probably therefore of Virgil.

But can the idiom exemplified in class B be similarly explained? I think it can, if we admit the popularity of Pliny in the early

Middle Ages, which is notorious, and in England, for which the evidence is again brought forward by Wright (p. 37). Pliny makes the following statement (34, 7, 18): "Fecit et Sp. Carvilius Jovem . . . Reliquis limae suam statuam fecit, quæ est ante pedes simulacri ejus." It is upon the *reliquis limæ* that an argument must be founded. This would appear to be identical with *fœle lāfe*, and if it were actually so, the proof would be almost overwhelming. The *reliquæ limæ*, however, can be nothing else than the Greek *ἀινῆμα*, while the *fœle lāfe*, being that which is *spared* by the file, is rather to be compared with the statue of Jupiter, which Pliny is here describing. But nothing is more likely than that the idiom of class B is colored by that of class A, in so far as all the instrumentalities of class B are more or less harsh and destructive. The idea of escape from injury and annihilation being uppermost in the mind, as is natural in a more warlike and sanguinary age, classes A and B, distinct in the Latin, might easily approximate more closely to each other in Old English.

ALBERT S. COOK.

NOTES.

THE LAUGHING LOAN.

In the Proverbs of Hendyng, v. 192, we find "Selde comeþ lone lahynde hom." (Böddeker, Antengl. Dichtungen des MS Harl. 2253, p. 295; Rel. Ant. I 113, where the poem was first printed; Kemble, Salomon and Saturn, p. 276; Mätzner, Altengl. Sprachproben, I 309; Morris and Skeat, Specimens, II 40.)

Mätzner is the only editor who comments on the line. He cites Bohn, Handbook, p. 293: "A loan should come laughing home," and Hislop, Prov. of Scotland, 1862, p. 2: "A borrowed len' should gae laughing hame." Bohn's proverb is repeated by Hazlitt, Eng. Prov. p. 23, and Hislop is anticipated by Kelly, Complete Collection of Scottish Provs., 1818, p. 4: "A borrow'd loan should come laughing home.—What a man borrows he should return with thankfulness, rather better than worse." Hislop's explanation, which he gives with a ?, runs: "When we return an article that has been borrowed, to its owner, we should do it with a good grace."

A school-boy saying mentioned by Henderson, Folk-Lore of the Northern Counties, 1879, p. 28, throws light on the matter. He says: "An odd expression was connected with the lending a knife among boys for the cutting up of a cake or other dainty. The borrower was asked to give it back *laughing*, i. e. with some of the good thing it was used to cut." To this may be added a passage in the 12th century Ysengrimus (Mone's Reinardus Vulpes). The Sow has offered to say mass, and Ysengrimus replies (vii 47):

"Ius didici, matrina, tuum, nunc accipe nostrum
(Ridendo redeant prestita liba domum) :"

and then goes on to add his proposition to hers. Voigt (at p. 367 of whose beautiful ed., Halle, 1884, the passage may be found) cites Hoffmann v. Fallersleben, Altniederländische Sprichwörter, No. 364: "Gheleent ghelt sal men al lachende betalen, Mutuo quod debes, ridendo soluere debes."

Hendyng's saw appears then to mean: "A borrower seldom gratefully and cheerfully returns what he has borrowed," and this interpretation suits the context.

GEORGE LYMAN KITTREDGE.

THE COMPOUNDED VERB IN THE NALA.

The following list of compounded verb-forms was collected from the *Nalopākhyānam* (ed. M. Williams), and is exhaustive for that section of the *Mahābhārata*. The total number of verbal roots found in the Nala is 264, represented by 2795 occurrences, of which 1151 are personal forms, the remaining 1644 being participles, gerunds and infinitives. Of these, 1080, or nearly 40 per cent., occur in composition with prepositions, as follows:

With *ā*, 46 roots, 179 occurrences.—*anu*, 19 r. 49 o. + *sam* 1 r. 2 o.—*ati*, 2 r. 3 o.—*adhi*, 4 r. 7 o.—*apa*, 5 r. 12 o.—*antar*, 2 r. 6 o.—*abhi*, 19 r. 39 o. + *ā*, 1 r. 2 o. + *anu*, 1 r. 1 o. + *vi*, 1 r. 1 o. + *sam*, 1 r. 1 o.—*ava*, 12 r. 20 o.—*upa*, 21 r. 52 o. + *ā*, 2 r. 2 o. + *sam*, 2 r. 2 o. + *sam* + *pra*, 1 r. 1 o.—*urdhva*, 1 r. 1 o.—*ud*, 16 r. 54 o. + *ā*, 1 r. 1 o.—*ni*, 20 r. 53 o.—*nis*, 7 r. 10 o. + *ud*, 1 r. 1 o.—*parā*, 2 r. 3 o.—*pari*, 24 r. 44 o. + *upa*, 1 r. 1 o.—*puras*, 1 r. 1 o.—*pra*, 55 r. 169 o. + *ā*, 1 r. 1 o. + *ud*, 1 r. 1 o.—*prati*, 15 r. 36 o.—*vi*, 52 r. 119 o. + *ā*, 4 r. 9 o. + *adhi*, 1 r. 1 o. + *apa*, 2 r. 2 o. + *abhi*, 1 r. 1 o. + *ni*, 3 r. 3 o. + *nis*, 7 r. 9 o. + *pari*, 1 r. 2 o. + *pra*, 2 r. 3 o.—*sam*, 42 r. 79 o. + *ā*, 17 r. 45 o. + *ati*, 1 r. 4 o. + *adhi*, 1 r. 1 o. + *anu*, 3 r. 13 o. + *abhi*, 2 r. 2 o. + *alam*, 1 r. (kr) 2 o. + *ava*, 1 r. 1 o. + *ud*, 3 r. 5 o. + *upa*, 6 r. 7 o. + *ni*, 2 r. 2 o. + *pra*, 5 r. 10 o. + *vi*, 1 r. 1 o. + *anu* + *pra*, 1 r. 1 o.

Composition with one prep. 938; with two, 140; with three, 2.

The roots compounded with the principal prepositions in the order of their frequency are: With *vi* 52, *ā* 46, *sam* 42, *pra* 25, *pari* 24, *upa* 21, *ni* 20, *abhi* 19, *ud* 16, *prati* 15, *ava* 12. For the older language, RV. and AV., the order is *pra*, *ā*, *vi*, *sam*, *abhi*, *ni*, *ud*, *pari*, *anu*, *upa*, *prati*, *ava* (Whitney, Gram. 1077a).

The verb occurs in composition other than with prepositions some 350 times, of which about 300 are occurrences of the participle as member of a compound verb. The rest are (a) composition with personal pronouns and nouns, the participle having lost the verbal force and become adverbial, as *tvatkṛte*; (b) with noun and participle, forming a simple verb-idea, as *namas-kr*, *sat-kr*; (c) with adverbs, the compound being purely artificial, except in one instance, XVII 30, where *api* is used with prepositional force.

R. ARROWSMITH.

ON ΠΙΠΙΝ.

In Professor Merriam's edition of the famous Gortynian Inscription (Am. Journ. of Archaeology, I 4, p. 340) I find the following note : " *πρίν* with subjunctive after affirmative clause is uniform throughout the inscription, except X 26 ; so in IV 10 the optative [so C.,¹ BZ.,² BB.;³ the inf., Prof. Gildersleeve]." As Professor Merriam has not chosen to give my reason for the inf., it seems necessary to explain why I differ at this point from the scholars who have edited the inscription. In my article on *πρίν* in this Journal, II 480, I undertook to dispose of Hermann's explanation of the rule which requires that *πρίν* with subj. must depend on a negative clause. " Is it necessary," I ask in conclusion, " to repeat that language settles into certain grooves of expression ? Theoretically you might have *πρίν ἀντί* after a positive sentence. There is no logic against it, any more than there is against *οὐτε* or *έπειδή* with the fut. ind. In later Greek *πρίν οὐτίς* is common enough after affirmative sentences." And now, in ample confirmation of what I have said, we have *πρίν* after positive sentences. But how ? Why, in perfect conformity with the groove into which language had settled—a groove formulated years ago in my Justin Martyr, Apol. I, c. 4, l. 13 : " When *πρίν* *must* be translated ' before,' it *must* have the inf. When it *may* be translated ' until,' it *may* take the finite construction of *ἔως*, ' until.' " Now, in this inscription, everywhere that *πρίν* with subj. occurs after a positive clause, it is to be translated " until." So I 9. 31. 33; V 34; VI 50; VII 40; XII 31; whereas in IV 10 the translation requires " before," and hence the normal inf. is to be accepted and not the opt. This will, I hope, suffice to relieve me of the appearance of differing arbitrarily from the editors.

B. L. G.

¹ C., Comparetti.² BZ., Bücheler-Zitelmann.³ BB., Baunacks.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Römische Geschichte von THEODOR MOMMSEN. Fünfter Band. Die Provinzen von Caesar bis Diokletian. Mit zehn Karten von H. KIEPERT. Berlin, Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung, 1885.

The world has been looking forward for many years to Mommsen's fourth volume, which should take up the story of the Roman Empire, "so much more abused than known," as he himself has said—that volume which should make Tiberius and Hadrian and Aurelius live again for us, and should give us a portrait gallery to match the earlier pictures of Pyrrhus and Hannibal and Caesar. The hand has not lost its cunning, the pencil knows how to make sharp outlines here and subtle shades there, but the master of Roman history has given us instead of the fourth volume the fifth, in which he tells us we are to look for none of those details that made the other volumes so fascinating. We are to have no psychological effects, no medallion portraits. "The book was written in a spirit of renunciation, and in a spirit of renunciation it must be read." Yet, though we are exhorted to renounce, the renunciation is not so terrible a task as it might seem; and in any case Mommsen himself consoles us as best he may for the missing books—for the sixth, which would have represented the struggle of the republicans against the monarchy and the definite establishment of the empire; for the seventh, the theme of which would have been the peculiar character of the monarchical rule and the influence of the several emperors on the fortunes of the state. The former of these subjects, he says, is so well known from ancient authorities, that he could only have told the story after others; the latter has at any rate been treated by many historians, whereas the history of the provinces from Caesar to Diocletian is nowhere connectedly told for the public to whom this work is addressed, and the absence of such an exhibit is the reason why the period of the Roman Empire is so often falsely and unfairly judged. The fourth volume would be a fragment without the fifth, just as the fifth is a fragment without the fourth. By the time this inadequate notice is published, the work will probably be accessible to English readers, and the modest task, the only one to which the present writer considers himself equal, that of giving some notion of the wealth of the book, will be superfluous. Mommsen's enemies have had much to say against the freedom of his style, which is supposed to be too journalistic. Of this a foreigner, however familiar with the language, cannot undertake to be a judge in comparison with native critics; but there can be no mistake about the potent vitality that makes Mommsen's work irresistibly fascinating. We are not so much concerned about the dignity of the German Clio as we are about the correctness of the results, the sweep of the combinations, the distinctness of the impression. Fastidious critics may object to the modernizing of Roman relations, but those fastidious critics have yet to learn that we are still living the life of the Romans, and that the Greeks were the last of the ancients.

But it is impossible wholly to divorce Rome from the antique, and it is not to be denied that our own time is always made too palpably present in Mommsen's narrative and in his reflections, and that the parallelisms are not always fortunate, as when in the third volume he wrote of the slaveholder aristocracy of Virginia and Ohio (p. 459). One does not like to be ever on the alert for allusions to the politics of Germany, to be hunting for the key to an enigma, the point of a sarcasm. When a man has attained Mommsen's eminence, he writes for the world, and the world does not study the political life of Germany with the minute interest that is natural in a German by reason of the novelty of any political life whatever. Still, to a man of Mommsen's genius, this interweaving of the life that now is and the life that was seems to be inevitable, and most persons will prefer it to the unreality of those historians who take up their abode in a No-Man's Land, which has no relation to anything we know or see. In their hands the antique becomes ghostlike, phantasmal. This is not wholly the fault of book-study, nor can it be wholly remedied by familiarity with the material remains of antiquity, as the archaeologists would claim. Even when brought into daily contact with the relics of antiquity, minds of a certain order assume an unreal pose: a dish is no longer a dish, a jar is no longer a jar, a doll no longer a doll. But those, on the other hand, who find it necessary to interpret antique life into terms of their own experience, almost inevitably fall into caricature and travesty. If they translate, the calm original is distorted into modern grimace; the every-day word is endued with a portentous color. If they describe political characters, political combinations, they invoke modern parallels, they tack modern nicknames to antique personages, they make free use of modern slang, of 'caucus' and 'rings' and 'log-rolling' and 'pipe-laying.' Perhaps anything is better than unreality, and yet vivacity is not vitality. The constant application of modern relations to the antique is sometimes simply distracting, when it is not absolutely bewildering, and he who attempts to wield Mommsen's brush, should make sure first that he has as much material for his color.

But it is time to give at least the titles of the thirteen chapters of which Mommsen's eighth book consists:

1. The Northern Frontier of Italy.
2. Spain.
3. The Gallic Provinces.
4. Roman Germany and the Free Germans.
5. Britain.
6. The Danubian Regions and the Wars on the Danube.
7. European Greece.
8. Asia Minor.
9. The Euphrates Frontier and the Parthians.
10. Syria and Nabathaea.
11. Judaea and the Jews.
12. Egypt.
13. The African Provinces.

On each one of these subjects Mommsen has brought to bear his unrivalled wealth of knowledge, which streams in from every sphere of Roman life, his wonderful power of combination, his vivid and mordant style. The details may not always be interesting in themselves, but the meaning of the details is not withheld, and we learn, as we learn from few works, what expenditure of toil and material is needful for the electric light that is to illuminate history. So many writers hide whatever light they have under the bushel of learning, so many give us nothing but clever phosphorescence. Each chapter is a monograph, and may be studied independently, and so the reader is free to take up whatever subject interests him most—whatever subject is likely to suggest the most vivid parallels. To me, the disengagement of the life of Greece and the

Greeks from the tangled web of the common Graeco-Roman life has always seemed to be one of the most fascinating problems for the student, and it is strange that whole stretches of later Greek literature lie absolutely untilled, at least by scholars of English speech, and men prefer to limit their vision to fields where only the scantiest gleanings can possibly fall to the lot of the most resolute and sagacious explorer, rather than subdue an immense extent of important territory, because the ground is post-classic ; as if the classic could be understood without the post-classic ! To be bold, who reads Plutarch outside of a few of the Lives ? And yet who is not richer for reading Plutarch ? In the last volume of the Encyclopaedia Britannica, Professor Paley says, "It is certain that to most persons in Britain, even to those who call themselves scholars, the *Opera Moralia* of Plutarch are practically almost unknown " ; and perhaps the distinguished scholar himself has given one of the most delightful instances of the incurious way in which post-classic Greek authors are treated, when he says at the close of his article, " It is strange that no modern edition of the *Opera Moralia* exists." To Plutarch, Mommsen, no lover of Greeklings generally, does ample justice ; and he makes much use of Dion Chrysostomos, who may be called an unworked mine of information about a period in which literary documents are sadly lacking. It is true that the authors of the second century weary by their affectation, their unreality. The smartness of Lucian palls after a while ; it is only when one has learned to see the skin under the paint that the interest becomes tragic ; it is true that Aristeides is jejune, that Maximus Tyrius is irritating, that Philostratos is a jerky *feuilletoniste* ; but, for all that, most important lessons are to be learned from each and every one ; and the clumsy fingers that now find no better employment than the delicate task of conjectural criticism might be doing good work among the monuments of a period that we must understand in order to understand ourselves. The measure of a man's knowledge of the literature of the period is his appreciation of what Mommsen has drawn from it ; and when one knows enough to understand in part his allusions to the literature proper, there remains the jurisprudence, there remains the mass of epigraphic material which no one commands historically as he does. At the same time, those whose love for Hellas and the Hellenes survives the battle of Chaironeia, who cherish the remains of Greek life—political, social, artistic—not only on Greek soil and in Greek blood, but wherever manifested, those who cannot abandon the thought of a continuous tradition of things Greek will be inclined to rebel against the cruel light in which Mommsen has put the later history of Greece. Is the strongest glare really the truest illumination ? To Mommsen the later Greek is a *Graeculus*, and he holds the conduct of the luckless *epigonois* to as stern an account as Cobet does their language. In order to understand, one must love, and Mommsen has no love for political failures, for failures of any kind. The exuberance of the intellectual and artistic development of the Greeks had exhausted its political life ; or, to use his figure, the redundancy of the flower had been fatal to the calyx, and so flower and calyx are cast into the oven by our Rhadamanthys. But I hope to recur to this subject at a later day.

The local interest of the English in the Britons has led their scholars to complain that Mommsen has fobbed off Britain with too brief a notice. The complaint is a curious illustration of the failure of perspective where one's

interests are concerned. Germany, of course, has not been neglected, and the inevitable Varus affair in the *Tentoburgiensis saltus* figures at length.

The chapter on Judaea and the Jews is of even more general interest than the chapter on Greece. Needless to say, it is full of contemporary significance. The very first sentence tells us what we have to expect. "The history of Judaea is as little the history of the Jewish people as the history of the Papal States is the history of the Catholics. It is as necessary to separate the two as it is to study both together."

But in the case of a book like this, the temptation to read aloud, as it were, is one that must be resisted. The detailed criticism belongs to other and more competent hands; but, while awaiting the judgment of specialists on special points, it would have been unbecoming not to give emphatic, if inadequate, notice of a work that every classical philologist who wishes to understand his own sphere must study, must settle with.

B. L. G.

Andocides de Mysteriis. Edited with Critical and Explanatory Notes, by W. J. HICKIE. London, Macmillan & Co., 1885.

An English commentator who in matters syntactical goes beyond a timid reference to Goodwin, or of late to Hadley-Allen, is an exception to the rule, and hence Mr. Hickie's school-edition of Andokides challenges something more than a passing notice; and without stopping to comment on the pedantry of parading a host of authorities on small matters, or on the utter slovenliness of the accentuation, or on the dogmatism of the style, I proceed to remark on a few points in which Mr. Hickie has undertaken to act as a guide to others.

§1. "When two nouns, coupled by *kai*, have each of them the article prefixed, they represent two distinct and *different* notions. But when the article is used with the first noun, and omitted with the second, both notions apply to the *same* person or thing. Rightly, therefore, S. Peter II 1, 12 [1, 11], etc. This is theoretical grammar of the Lindley Murray order of architecture. Even theoretically the rule is wretchedly put. Theoretically, one article to two or more nouns brings about a unity, a totality, whether of concordances or discordances. See Classen on Thuk. 1, 6, 1, and often, for Classen does not fail to reinforce his rules. Practically, however, the Greeks are apt to be as careless as we are habitually. See Professor Short, On the Order of Words in Attic Greek Prose, p. xv: "When two or more nouns are connected by a copulative conjunction and the article is employed, it is used with each . . . or only with the first . . . [I omit Xenophon as a βδέληγμα to Mr. Hickie] τῆς τε Ἰταλίας καὶ Σικελίας, Thuc. 1, 36; and this not only when the nouns are distinctive, but even when they are opposed; as περὶ τοῦ μεῖζονος καὶ ἐλάττονος, Plat. Euthyph. 7c: περὶ τοῦ βαρυτέρου τε καὶ κονφοτέρου, ib." See also his remarks on the English usage in A. J. P. IV 254 ff.: "The omission of the article in Greek has about the same range as in English, but the instances are less numerous." Professor Lamberton, in his recently issued edition of Thuk. VI, VII, calls attention to this, 6, 17, l. 10; 6, 44, l. 4; 6, 85, l. 3; 7, 14, l. 7 [8]; and even if Thukydides is not model Greek, it is better to cite him than to cite disputed passages of S. Peter and S. Paul, which revive sad memories of Middleton and the Greek article, Winer and all

the rest. In any case, Plato is not to be flung on the same dust-heap with Xenophon. Theait. 149 C : τὰς κνόσας καὶ μῆ, 150 B : τὸ ἀληθές τε καὶ μῆ and to crown the matter 186 A : τὸ δμοιν καὶ τὸ ἀνδμοιν καὶ τὸ ταῦτὸν καὶ ἔτερον. But this is what our English friends would call fourth form eruditio.

§4. “οἰχήσομαι. The future indicative is selected to express the *undoubting confidence* of his enemies that he would adopt this latter course.” The charm of this explanation becomes more evident from the context: αὐτῷ ἐγὼ πολλῶν μοι ἀπαγγελλόντων διτι λέγοιν οἱ ἔχθροι ὡς ἄρα ἐγὼ σὺν ὑπομείναμι οἰχήσομαι τε φένγων. There cannot be any difference in the confidence of Andokides' enemies as to the two courses, one of which is but the negative expression of the other. See A. J. P. III 454.

§7. πρὶν ἀν ἀκούσατε. “When ἀν is present, the result is represented as *more doubtful*.” It is high time to abandon this antiquated explanation, in view of all the work that has been done on this particle of late years. See A. J. P. II 480; IV 89: πρὶν ἀν has become a formula like ὅταν, like εἴν. The omission of ἀν is archaic where it is not due to the blunder of the scribe.

§8. The distinction between ὅτι and ὡς is badly put. Strictly speaking, ὅτι is ‘that,’ and ὡς is ‘how.’ ‘How’ naturally colors more than ‘that,’ and makes the author responsible for the point of view. ‘False’ and ‘true’ are not proper words to use of ὡς and ὅτι, and ‘subjective’ and ‘objective’ are not of much avail. The difference is one that must not be urged, as it is often dormant (comp. *dass* and *wie* in colloquial German), and yet the number of passages in which it can be brought out by the simple observance of the English equivalents is much larger than is commonly supposed. When my students are in trouble on this score, I bid them read Coleridge’s ‘Love,’ ‘All thoughts, all pleasures, all delights to the end.’ It is enough.

§8. According to Mr. Hickie, ὅτα βούλοιτο’ ἀν is potential optative, but ὅστε ἀν βούλοιτο would be ‘a case of suppressed protasis.’ So Isai. 5, 33: οἵστε ἀν αἴροιτο γνοῖεν, sc. εἰ γνοῖεν. Thuk. 8, 54: ὅπῃ ἀν αἴροιτο δοκοῖη, sc. εἰ τι πράσσεται δοκοῖη. One might have hoped that this suppressed-protasis explanation, especially G. Hermann’s fancy that the protasis is to be supplied out of the verb of the apodosis, had died the death. G. Hermann’s proof was a proof that completely settled the question the other way, as any one can see who weighs the verse, Aischyl. Ag. 1049: πειθοῖτο’ ἀν εἰ πειθοῖτο’, ἀπειθοῖτος δὲ λοιπός. See Bäumlein, Griech. Mod. p. 288. As for the passages cited, no careful grammarian would cite either Isai. 5, 33 or Thuk. 8, 54, where corruption is suggested by the neighborhood of αἴροιτο and αἴροιτο. The forms of αἴροιτο have done so much to cause the omission and insertion of ἀν that a wary investigator must leave such passages on one side.

§14. We have another note which by its confident tone may impose on young students. “There is no more certain test of the accuracy of individual Greek writers than their use of passives (or equivalent forms) with ἵπτο and a genitive. In the best writers this genitive almost invariably denotes *personal*, or at least *living* objects. Thus, while Aeschines in his three orations, containing 6,015 lines, exhibits five instances where such objects are *inanimate* and *impersonal* (*Cles.* 7. 207. 239; *Timarch.* 178; *Fals. Leg.* 62), Xenophon, in his ‘Convivium’ and ‘Oeconomicus’ (in which latter work I can discover no grammatical or stylistic reason for questioning its authorship), though he

uses *ιπό* with a genitive only forty-three times, yet has no less than twenty-two examples of this faulty construction in the space of 3466 lines! and in one passage (*Oeon. XIX 11*) has three such in the same paragraph. On the other hand, in the three genuine orations of Andocides not a single instance is to be found—for *δεσμῶν* in §2 implies living agents; nor yet one in Hyperides, if we except *c. Dem. XIX 16*, where it has been inserted by his editors.” Statistic can only be met by statistic, and no one will be at the pains to count after Mr. Hickie in a matter in which he shows so little comprehension of the real state of things. *ιπό* with a thing personifies it, and to that extent gives a certain poetical color, a certain imaginative light, but to make it a test of accuracy, to speak of it as a faulty construction, is to confound grammatical correctness with stylistic peculiarity. Any author may on occasion be guilty of this personification or semi-personification. Cicero, as is well known, has a weakness for personifying with *ab*, but even those who spoke of him as *non satis expolitus et splendens*, would hardly have attacked his grammatical accuracy. And so the best of the Greeks use *ιπό* when it suits them. I will not cite Lysias—perhaps he picked up the faulty locution in the West—and yet 12, 3, which falls under my eyes as I write, is tempting: *ἡνάγκασμαι ἵπὸ τῶν γεγενημένων τούτου κατηγορῆσαι*. I cannot hold even the idolized Demosthenes guiltless. See 6, 8; 8, 71; 19, 61; 20, 166; 23, 143, references for which I am indebted to Rehdantz. Of course persons are involved in some cases, but why not say personification is involved in all and simplify the matter? Note the prodigious vigor of Dem. 21, 96: *καὶ ταῦτα πέπονθεν ἵπὸ Μειδίου καὶ τοῦ Μειδίου πλούτου καὶ τῆς ἑπερφανίας.*¹ Here, as elsewhere, Demosthenes shows the school of Thukydides, Thuk. 1, 76, 2; *ἵπὸ τῶν μεγίστων νικηθέντες, τιμῆς καὶ δέονς καὶ ὀφελίας*. Nor will most scholars agree with Mr. Hickie in excluding from the count Aischines, 1, 42; 90; 3, 218, which it is fair to suppose Mr. Hickie thought he had good reason for leaving out. The subject is well worth pursuing, as personification and semi-personification are always well worth noting among personal peculiarities of expression, but accuracy is not the word. Who would change Hdt. 1, 39: *φέγξ τοι τὸ δνειρὸν ἵπὸ αἰχμῆς σιδηρέης φάναι ἐμὲ τελευτήσειν?* But this last example, with its two accusatives, brings me to another note.

§16. “The strictly correct order is, that the subject of the infinitive follow and the object of the infinitive precede, as here [ἐμήννεσεν . . . μνασθεῖα ποτεῖν 'Αλκιβιάδην].” Then he cites Dem. 4, 19, 23; Thuk. 4, 73; Antiph. 5, 39, and the prose writers *passim*. *Passim* is an authority which is not held in as much honor now as formerly. We demand instead exhaustive statistic, and *passim* will not answer. We want something better. *Passim* might land us in Lykurg. 87: *φασὶ τὸν περιλειμμένον* (subj.) *σπασάμενον τὸς ξιφος ἀποκτείναι τὸν Κόδρον* (obj.). Could there be greater carelessness than we find in Dem. 54, 31: *μαρτυρήσαι μὴ πατάξαι Κένωνα* (subj.) *'Αρίστωνα* (obj.)? I pick up Antiphon (5) and find subj. obj. in §§36, 42, 49. I turn to the story of Er (Plato, Rpb. 10) and find examples in 614 C and E. I open Isokrates at random; he is a fairly careful soul, and there I am met (12, 19) by subj. obj. I dip into another and find the same thing. One *passim* is as good as another. Of course, Mr. Hickie will say that the poets do not count; but as he himself has cited of all authorities the *Anacreontea*, we may cite a number of passages from Pindar, not an exhaustive exhibit of his usage, but, for all that, sufficient

to show that no principle is involved except that of common sense. Subj. obj. O 1, 100; P 4, 15, 141, 278; N 7, 25; obj. subj. O 1, 36–40 (where see note). 103; P 4, 109; N 7, 84; I 7 (8), 40, 46. Obj. subj. followed by subj. obj. (chiasm) O 9, 53 sqq. Not over clear P 1, 67, where I give obj. subj., while some of the best scholars differ as to subject and obj. in N 1, 65. But it is utterly unprofitable to pursue this subject. The ambiguity was there, and all that we can say is that the Greeks were too sensible to care about the ambiguity, until they reached the wretched stage of rhetoric and grammar in which ἀμφιβολία plays a sufficiently conspicuous part. That there was not one kind of ambiguity for Greek and another for Latin is evident from a comparison of the passages in Quint. 7, 9 and 8, 2, 16, with Aristeides, II 508, Hermog. π. μ. δ. II 454, Theon, Progym. II 82, 83. As for the oracular response 'said to have been given to King Pyrrhus in *Latin*', no matter how it had been expressed in Greek, it must have carried with it the same ambiguity as ὁ Ζεῦ, γένοιτο καταβαλεῖν τὸν σὺν ἐμῷ, and Mr. Hickie's φημὶ σε, Διακίδη, νικᾶν δύνασθαι τοῖς 'Ρωμαίοις does not give an inevitable sense.

§19. Simply astounding is the following remark: "This particular expression [*ἐγώ εἰπον*] is probably without example in Attic prose. 'ἐγώ εἰπον inusitatum.' Schneider, Plat. *Rep.* V, p. 449 C." Schneider says nothing of the kind, and his remark applies only to *ἐγώ, εἰπον* ["I, said I"], and the unexampled *ἐγώ εἰπον* can be found by anybody who will be at the pains of looking for it. Plato alone gives example after example. So in the well-known interview of Sokrates with Diotima in the Symposium 202 C: *κάγὼ εἰπον*. So 204 C: *καὶ ἐγώ εἰπον*. So 204 D. *εἰπον ἐγώ*, 205 A. As for the construction of *εἰπον* itself, it is high time to stop the cry about the bad Greek of the inf. after the verb in the sense of saying. It is not a model construction, but it is perfectly justifiable on the basis of Attic usage, as I have pointed out repeatedly. So in Just. Martyr, Apol. I 12, 32; A. J. P. IV 88; and to the numerous examples there given may be added Politic. 263 C, 290 B. The Andokidean passage (I, 57) is not noticed by Mr. Hickie until he comes to §80, and then he brings in also §64, which has nothing to do with it, as being on his own interpretation an anacoluthon. As illustrations of *εἰπεῖν* 'say,' with inf. he carelessly adduces Menex. 240 A and Phaidon 59 E, where *εἰπεῖν* is 'order.' If Mr. Hickie had studied his seventh ed. of L. and S., which he seldom cites, except to abuse, he would have found the matter succinctly put s. v. *εἰπον*, I 1 end. Only under III L. and S. have the misprint, Phaeadr. 59 E, a misprint which corrects itself for the student of Plato. It is Phaedo 59 E, the passage which, as we have seen, Mr. Hickie selects as an exemplification of the other meaning.

These remarks might be prolonged indefinitely, but it is hardly worth while. An editor who would commend a new classic text for school use should remember that it is his duty to make up for the lack of the accumulated labor of a long line of predecessors by the most unsparing toil, and, in my judgment, Andokides is well worthy of that toil. Never was Herodes Atticus more mistaken than when he said: 'Ανδοκίδον μὲν βελτίων εἰμί. The gleanings of the grapes of the fifth century before Christ is better than the vintage of the second century after Christ. The exceptional position of Andokides as a gentleman orator makes his diction and his syntax of especial importance, and while it is a hopeless task to attempt to put him in the place of Xenophon,

close study of Andokides would be remunerative. Mr. Hickie can hardly be said to have made a good beginning, but his very mistakes show his appreciation of the value of a high Attic standard.¹

B. L. G.

Geschichte des gelehrten Unterrichts auf den deutschen Schulen und Universitäten vom Ausgang des Mittelalters, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf den classischen Unterricht von Dr. F. PAULSEN. Leipzig, Veit & Co., 1885.

The fifteenth century, which witnessed the creation of no less than ten German universities, is pregnant with interest to the student of the birth and development of German educational institutions, from the fact that it combines both the old and the new—the tendencies of expiring mediaevalism and of the culture of the Renaissance destined to transform the majority of the universities in the two decades preceding the Reformation. Denifle's work on the universities of the Middle Ages, the first volume of which has recently been issued, is designed to supply a long-felt want. We regret, however, that the learned archivist of the Vatican, whose researches have led to striking results in reference to the foundation of the University of Paris, should have determined upon the year 1400 as the terminal point of his investigations. Paulsen's delimitation of the field of research is the result of keener historical insight; and his volume is adapted to serve as a continuation of a history of the mediæval *studium generale*.

The sketch of the character of instruction in the *septem artes liberales* and of the vicissitudinous activity of the *poetae*, serving as an introduction to Paulsen's description of the struggle and victory of the humanists, cannot compensate us for the lack of a thorough investigation of the period beginning with the foundation of the University of Leipzig in 1409, and closing with the year 1502, when Wittenberg was established. Bursian's "History of Classical Philology" is too limited in its aim to grasp in its entirety the character of a period to which additional interest is lent by the approaching five hundredth anniversary of the Heidelberg University.

It has not been Paulsen's purpose to recite the history of learned instruction in detail, but to arrange the vast material in such a compendious form that his readers may gain a survey of the development of both school and university, to the interrelation of which recent German writers have failed to attach sufficient importance. The description of the varying form of instruction, reflecting the religious, philosophic and paedagogic tendencies of each age, affords the author opportunity to characterize briefly the "*Zeitgeist*" of each particular epoch. In general we believe these will find acceptance, though we must demur here and there to his conception of particular individuals. So, for example, it is a partial statement to assert that Savonarola's fall was the result of his opposition to the humanistic aspirations of his day.

¹ A friend of mine, who is also a friend of Xenophon, and is duly indignant at Mr. Hickie's onslaught on his favorite, calls my attention to the fact that after vilipending Xenophon, Mr. Hickie constantly cites him as an authority, without a word of warning; and I would add on my own account that the tone of the book towards men who have deserved well of Greek letters is so harsh that it might well have provoked all the asperity that I have eliminated from the first draught of this notice.

If any previous declaration of his position is needed by the historian of paedagogy, we suggest the saying of Goethe: "Ueber Abgeschiedene eigentlich Gericht halten wollen, möchte niemals der Billigkeit gemäss sein. Nicht was sie gefehlt und gelitten, sondern was sie geleistet und gethan, beschäftigt die Hinterbliebenen." We must give credit to Paulsen for having honestly attempted to treat the subject objectively, though when he comes to discuss the curriculum of the modern gymnasium, he cannot check the expression of personal feeling. His book, therefore, is in so far valuable, and its tendency in this regard entitles him to the recognition of those, whose opinions of the excellence or worthlessness of educational endeavors are not moulded by the adoption of a method as subjective as that of Raumer, whose book is a striking example of the indefensibility of foisting upon the history of paedagogy judgments dictated solely by an orthodox theology. "Die Geschichte kann nur den belehren, der ihr zuhört, nicht den, der ihr zuredet."

A sharper line of demarcation between the humanists who followed the Reformers and those who clung to the Church of Rome, would have rendered clearer the chapter on humanism at the time of the Reformation. We miss here an adequate presentation of the character of Reuchlin and of his activity in the new cause, of which he was a leader. The peculiar nature of the alliance between Luther and Ulrich von Hutten is satisfactorily explained. Luther at heart was not a genuine humanist, but when the separation from Rome became an irrevocable fact, his indomitable will exercised a paramount influence over all Protestant humanists. Melanchthon found himself, to his own surprise, drawn in a direction utterly foreign to the natural bent of his mind. The appended table of statistics, giving the number of matriculates from 1500 to 1559, attests the disastrous influence of the "virus Lutheranum" upon the frequency of attendance at the universities.

The victory of the humanists created a devotion to the form of the classics, and in that form alone genius sought its fitting expression. For a century and a half the development of the vernacular was therefore paralyzed. Hence the endeavor to find a natural means of expression, culminating in the dependence upon France, at the time of Leibnitz, when to be a *galant homme* was the ideal of a slavish nobility. The day when "to fear God and sit a horse" sufficed, had departed.

The foundation of the University of Göttingen, with its motto of "Lehrfreiheit," ushers in that second humanistic era which took its rise in the reaction against the exaggerations of the pietistic movement. The new Renaissance substituted organic for mechanical theories in religion and philosophy. To the philologists now fell the direction of the new education; and they were installed in the temple of a religion which sought its inspiration in Parnassus rather than in the Mount of Olives. The Utopian dreams cherished by the early humanists became at last a waking reality; and Wilhelm von Humboldt, Wolf, the Schlegels, deify the universal and eternal spirit of Hellenism. Goethe, however, whom the Grecomaniac Schiller declared to be a Greek cast upon the world of northern barbarism to give birth to a new Hellas, never ceased to be something of a Goth.

The union of the new humanism and speculative philosophy affixed an impress upon the school system which remained till the present day. Now for

the first time was manifested the domination of that philosophy which had been trained by the new philological-historical method. Kant was the child of the old mathematical-physical school. But Hegel, to the influence of whose absolute rationalism Frederick William the Fourth ascribed the loss of "Gesinnung," was not the sole cause of that desire for "Bildung" which the present gymnasium strives to impart, while at the same time it is loath to let die that perfection of classical training which was the glory of such schools as Schulpforta. Behind Hegel looms up the giant form of Herder, whose influence was more potent than that of any other of the new lights in directing the course of German educational ideas. The king was furthermore in opposition to the tendencies of his age—its liberality of sentiment in religion and politics. Recent protests against the spirit of the gymnasia are but repetitions of the protests of his reign.

To the history of the gymnasia during the course of the present century Paulsen devotes the last two hundred pages of his volume. His discussion of the Real-schulen question is not sufficiently comprehensive, and the interest which attaches to the struggle of the new humanistic ideas for mastery of the schools has challenged his attention to such a degree that the development of the universities does not find a proportionate treatment.

Whether the present curriculum of the gymnasium, with the modifications effected by the decree of 1882, can long be maintained, is a question that Paulsen answers in the negative. We, who are wont to cherish optimistic views in regard to the excellence of the German schools, are often blind to that organized system of over-pressure, drawing in its train nervous prostration and a certain superficiality, of which the candidates for the Staatsexamen are themselves conscious. A celebrated professor and educator once said to the writer that the trial of teaching powers by examination was an utter failure; and his sentiments in regard to the inefficiency of the classical seminary in many of the smaller universities led to a vigorous dispute with a man of no less influence than Sauppe. We must confess the fact that the present system is incapable of giving birth to such coryphaei of learning as those who were the pride of a régime now extinct. The potency of the influence of Thiersch long preserved in South Germany that broad knowledge of antiquity which the Prussian system has annihilated. Paulsen recognizes the evils of over-pressure in schools as a fact, and proposes to lessen them by the abolition of the number of home "exercitia" (with which proposition we are glad to agree) and by the substitution of philosophy and German for the (*se judice*) excessive number of hours in the classics. We must protest against this proposition, contained in the concluding chapter, entitled "Final Considerations." That boys in the upper classes can receive with benefit instruction in Schopenhauer, Descartes or Lotze is so utterly incredible, that we can only believe Paulsen's love for his own professional study has misled him to advocate a cause unsupportable by cogent arguments. And, as regards his other proposition, the best of philological methods cannot find in the vernacular a substitute for the classics as a training-engine; and without that logical ability born of the association of the mind with the genius of ancient literature as it itself found expression, instruction in philosophy must for boys be invalid. The adoption of translations, doubtlessly recommended by Paulsen as a poultice to soothe

the injured feelings of those who fear the total extinction of a knowledge of classical antiquity, is a pitiable expedient. The inspiration of the form and "ethereal soul," to use Hegel's phrase, of Greek and Roman literature would necessarily be annihilated by such a substitution.

Paulsen's volume is valuable in so far as it contains a careful array of facts, a reproduction of the opinions of the great paedagogues of each age, and for its occasional stimulating effect. While the style is clear, it cannot be called either nervous or elegant.

HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.

A Handy Anglo-Saxon Dictionary: Based on Groschopp's Grein. Edited, Revised and Corrected, with Grammatical Appendix, List of Irregular Verbs, and Brief Etymological Features. By JAMES A. HARRISON (Washington and Lee Univ., Va.) and W. M. BASKERVILL, Ph. D. (Vanderbilt Univ., Nashville, Tenn.). New York and Chicago, A. S. Barnes & Co., 1885. Pp. 317. \$3.00.

To what extent the advance of the last two decades in the sympathetic interpretation of the thought and spirit of Anglo-Saxon England was made possible by the labors of Grein, as transmitted in his great *Bibliothek der Angelsächsischen Poesie*, with its marvellous Glossary, is best known to those who have best followed the injunction of Prof. March, to spend one's days and nights with Grein. To such it has also been apparent that no slight hinderance to the extension of these studies has, in the last few years, been occasioned by the retirement of these volumes from the trade. It was, therefore, with the view to mediate between commercial difficulties on the one hand, and the requirements of students on the other, that Prof. Wülker, several years ago, entrusted to a young scholar the task of preparing an abridgment of Grein's Glossary.¹ The relation of Groschopp's Grein to the original is that of a complete word-list with brief definitions, to a lexicon with exhaustive citations and references, and the explanation of special passages and idioms. In the American edition now before us we have a second variation from the original. While in the main it is but a translation of Groschopp, the editors believe to have added to the practical value of the book by the introduction of several new features to which they invite special attention: (1) an appendix giving "a working outline of Anglo-Saxon Grammar"; (2) cognate words from the Icelandic, Gothic, O. H. German and Mod. German are introduced "to show some of the etymological connections" of this poetic vocabulary; (3) a second appendix embraces a list of the Irregular Verbs in the body of the work; (4) Mod. English derivatives are indicated by special type.

More than a simple translation of Groschopp, which would have been justified by like considerations under which that abridgment was made, has therefore been aimed at. A more complete appropriation of the work is based on these 'practical features,' which are, however, certainly in part of questionable utility. With excellent Anglo-Saxon grammars of every grade now of easy access, no sufficient ground is apparent for materially increasing the cost of a special dictionary for the poetic literature by the addition of elementary

¹ Kleines Angelsächsisches Wörterbuch von C. W. M. Grein. Nach Grein's Sprachschatz der Angelsächsischen Dichter bearbeitet von Fr. Groschopp. Kassel, Wigand, 1883.

grammatical appendices. Any enlargement of the volume should have been made to contribute directly to the study of Anglo-Saxon poetry. A treatise, for example, on the metre and æsthetics of this verse would have formed a valuable appendix; or, better still, an extension in the body of the work itself might have been planned on an intermediate doctrine as to the exclusion of citations, etc., by which more of the advantages of the original would have been retained.

The adoption of etymological helps, on the other hand, is commendable. Full-faced type to mark modern correspondences is a well-approved device, and will both facilitate the acquisition of the old vocabulary, and contribute to an historic sense in the study of the language. The only restriction to be made here is one that concerns the manner in which right principles have been dealt with. For, after duly allowing for the position of the editors in disclaiming completeness in etymological matters, an excuse is still wanting for their lack of uniformity in what they attempt to give. No principle is discoverable in the use made of cognate forms: it is apparently by the merest chance that now a Gothic, now an Icelandic or an O. H. German word is cited, and that, too, after intervals covering words which again, for no evident reason, are entirely omitted in this regard. Modern German words are, however, introduced with some fulness, and the care bestowed on the special-type forms of Mod. English almost approaches equality of performance. Yet in these last respects such omissions of the obvious as the following will be readily found: *dugoð*, G. Tugend; *earfoð*, G. Arbeit; *edwit*, Mod. twit; *þeon*, G. ge-deihen; *þel-*, G. Diele; *þegen*, G. Degen; *trag* (read *træg*), G. träge; *lið*, G. G-lied—(the definition 'limb, limbs' is misleading: the pl. is not *lið*, but *liðu, leðu*); *samnian*, G. *sammeln*; *dwel* and *dol* should be connected; *wunian*, Mod. wont; *hrif*, Mod. midriff; *heregeatu*, Mod. heriot; *gæsne*, Mod. (obs.) geason, etc.

Although the editors have clearly had nothing above the most elementary needs in view in working out these etymological phases, it is difficult to see why more attention was not paid to secondary derivation. No intimation, for example, of the corresponding verbal forms *séon*, 'to see,' and *séon*, 'to filter,' accompanies *onsýn*, 'appearance,' and *onsýn*, 'deficiency'; *béot* is not referred to *behátan*; *gafol* to *giefan*; *onsæge* to *sigan*; *hiréd* (read *hired*) to its elements. The interesting compounds *lætterow* and *lærrow* are passed by, nor is the student made aware of the relation between *getawe* (read *getāwe*) and *geatwe*; (*un)forcāð* and *fracōð* (*fracod*).

In the case of *hapax legomena* the references are too often omitted. Wherever it is possible, such words should be explained. There is usually something special about them; they may be dialectal, as *searo-fearo* (<-*faru*); or possible scribal errors, as *swēg-leðer*; or due to a blunder on the part of scholars, as *færbu*. The last word has now for some time been rightly understood. To Cosijn belongs the credit of having first noticed (Beitr. VII 456) that a separation into two words is to be made: *fær* (n.) 'color,' and the numeral *bū*. The further derivation of *fær* gives the scheme: I. E. **parwō-*: **parwō-* (Lit. parwas)=*fær*: O. H. G. *far(a)wa*.

An unwelcome illustration of the persistent transmission of old errors is furnished in the fictitious infinitives *lihan*, *síhan*, *tihan*, *feohan*, *seohon* (sic); *scðnan* is still a reduplicating verb, and *felgan* usurps the place of *feolan*.

Although *téon*, 'to draw,' and *téon*, 'to censure,' are distinguished, to *of-téon* is ascribed the peculiar property of combining the two. How much longer are we to wait for editors of the *Béowulf* to comprehend the construction of the opening lines of that poem? So, too, in keeping with this kind of conservatism, to venture a denomination, we are not yet to be released from the themes: *ealdor lagu, feorh-lagu, ealdor-naru, feorh-naru.*

False quantities are not wanting; a few examples taken at random may illustrate: *drugian, drygian, dryge, crist, cristén, cristnian, cyle, fnæst, hruse, hrest* (Metr. 11^{bb}, < *hrēsan*, therefore 'falls,' not 'withers'), *Orgete*—(there is also considerable confusion in the treatment of the prefix *or-*), *sið* < *són*, *tucian, þryð, iu-man* (but *géo-man*), *wag*, 'wall,' *wædl*. Misprints like the following will be easily corrected: *her-lic* (but *hér*); *les* (but *lëssa*); *lat-hydig, lat-lice* (but *læt*); and *huru* (but *härnu*); *læreow* (but *læríow*); *wol-dæg, ðogoð, gloguð* (p. 60; an error borrowed from the German ed.), etc.

Until a common system of vowel accentuation may be agreed upon, consistency in each particular method is all that can be required. The present editors have not, in this matter, been sufficiently guarded at all points: *geár, gæsne* (but *gæmor*), and the preterits *scōp, (eo), scān (ea), scōc (eo), geafon*.

In closing this notice, gratitude must not be withheld for this service of the editors to the study of Anglo-Saxon poetry. Uniform definitions in English for the entire body of the poetic vocabulary will give heart to many to whom foreign languages are less familiar, to attempt to learn something of our ancient songs. Perhaps the way has now been paved to a poetic lexicon in which the peculiar phraseology and figuration of this poetry may receive systematic treatment. The need of a handy etymological dictionary of the Anglo-Saxon language, based upon exact philological principles, has certainly been made clear. May the want be speedily supplied!

JAMES W. BRIGHT.

Platonis Phaedo. The Phaedo of Plato. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by W. D. GEDDES, LL. D. Second Edition. London, Macmillan & Co., 1885.

"I trust that this second edition will not be found unworthy of following its predecessor, which had the merit, if no other, that it was the first edition of a Platonic Dialogue proceeding from Scotland and edited upon Scottish soil." This strong note of nationality with which Dr. Geddes closes the preface to his second edition of his *Phaedo* is hardly necessary. The book is intensely Scotch, or rather, Scottish. The few Scotish Hellenists are either mighty workers, like Veitch of blessed memory, or they are deeply imbued with metaphysics or literature. To the latter class Dr. Geddes belongs, and grammar is not his strong point, in spite of the noble tradition of Rudiman. Professor Geddes' *Phaedo* is a work of undeniable charm. His range of illustrative reading is great, his conception of the dialogue is admirable, the appended notes are full of interest and suggestiveness, and he who reads the dialogue simply for its literary charm or philosophical meaning cannot fail to be grateful for Professor Geddes' companionship. Grammatical points he usually dispatches by a reference to Riddell's *Digest*, an admirable work, surely, but, like many other admirable works, a positive disadvantage to the student who rests on it.

One or two passages may be cited in which a firmer grasp of grammatical phenomena would have been of decided advantage. In 102 C Sokrates says : Οὗτος ἀρά δὲ Σιμμίας ἐπωνυμίαν ἔχει σμικρός τι καὶ μέγας εἶναι ἐν μέσῳ δν ἀμφοτέρων τοῦ μὲν τῷ μεγέθει ὑπερέχειν τὴν σμικρότητα ὑπὲκχων (so Geddes with Madvig for ὑπερέχων), τῷ δὲ τῷ μέγεθος τῆς σμικρότητος παρέχων ὑπερέχον. This Madvig translates 'alterius magnitudini exigitatem suam superandam subministrans, alteri magnitudinem exigitatem superantem praebens,' or, as Mr. Archer-Hind has it, "Simmias submits his smallness to be exceeded by the greatness of Phaedo, and presents his greatness to exceed the smallness of Sokrates." Dr. Geddes seems to combine τοῦ μέν with τῷ . . . ὑπερέχειν, and makes μεγέθει a dative of measure—one construction being impossible and the other awkward—with a result in English which is portentous : "Simmias stands midway between both, supplying an exemplification of smallness by the superiority of the one (*i. e.*, Phaedo) in tallness, and in the case of the other (*i. e.*, Socrates) supplying an exemplification of tallness surpassing the other's small stature." Mr. Archer-Hind calls the passage 'a troublesome sentence,' and it must be confessed that it cannot be read trippingly ; and yet a single deliberate reading of it, with due regard to the correspondences of the μέν and δέ clauses, is enough for a clear comprehension. For my part I am inclined to prefer the παρέχων of Stephanus, cited by Dr. Geddes, to Madvig's ὑπέχων. The emendation is nearly if not quite as easy, the Platonic πουκίλα is sufficiently kept up by the shift of construction from infinitive to participle ; ὑπερέχειν ὑπέχων reminds one of Gorg. 497 B : ὑπέσχεις Σωκράτει ἔξελέγει, and there is perhaps too much sense of endurance for this passage, whereas παρέχων is more familiar and natural (Apol. 33 B; Phaidr. 228 E; Menon 70 C; Protag. 312 C), and we get a clearer chiasm. It seems to me also that παρέχων, which approaches πορίζων, is better suited than ὑπέχων for the συγγραφή, to which Sokrates humorously compares his formal statement as to the party of the one part (τοῦ μέν) and the party of the other part (τῷ δέ).

A curious piece of metaphysical grammar is found 77 E : "The connection of ἀναπειθώ with this clause would lead us to expect δεδύτας, but there is a subtlety in the genitive, inasmuch as it leaves undecided whether the apprehension is real or only assumed for the sake of argumentation. Compare Thuc. V 56, ὡς ἐρήμου οὐσις βία (τὴν πόλιν) αἰρόσαντες, where ὡς ἐρήμου [read ἐρήμου] οὐσια would have implied that it was more deserted than it proved to be." The 'subjectivity' lies in the ὡς and not in the genitive, and there can be no difference between the acc. and gen. in that regard. See many varieties of such shifts in Dr. Spieker's article, A. J. P. VI 328 foll. On the same passage Dr. Geddes says : "The παις of Greeks becomes avia among the Latins, Pers. v. 91, 'Disce, sed ira cadat naso rugosaque sanna | Dum veteres avias tibi de pulmone revello.' " παις and puer, γραῦς and avia, anicula have exactly the same spheres in both classic languages. Persius' avias recalls Plato's γραῦν θῆλος in Theaitetos, 176 B. 63 B., "Olympiodorus quotes it, μὴ ἄγαν [ἀκτῶν], which puts it hypothetically, 'if so be that I were not sad, instead of being, as I am, sad!'" We cannot refine on οὐ and μή with the participle in later Greek. See A. J. P. I 56. p. 69 E, *ei πιθανώτερός εἴμι . . . εὐ* ἀν ἔχοι is noted as if it were unusual, whereas examples occur in scores. Supplement the note on ἔαντόν = ἔμαντόν by A. J. P. VI 108. p. 94 D : "δόλιον—*i. e.*, ὥστε δεῖν δόλιον

μόνον"—can hardly be meant seriously. This would be ellipsis with a vengeance. p. 96 D: "On διά with acc., where we might expect genitive, see Bigg on Thuc. I 83." I see Bigg and find the futile note that the distinction between διά with acc. and διά with gen. does not seem to be observed there. Is it necessary to say for the hundredth time that it is never violated, 'owing to' or 'thanks to' covering every case that seems to be an exception? See my note on Justin Martyr, Apol. I, c. 23, 11.

A word or two on 74 B: τί δέ; *aīrā tā lōa ēstiv̄ bte ānūsā soi ēphān̄* ή η *isōt̄ηs ānūsōt̄ηs*; Dr. Geddes retains *aīrā tā lōa*, but is evidently dissatisfied, and with reason. If η is *aut.*, and not *an.*, we should inevitably have *aīrā tō lōov̄* and not *aīrā tā lōa*. Schleiermacher felt this, and wrote *aīrā tā lōa ēstiv̄ bte ānūsā soi ēphān̄* ή η *isōt̄ηs ānūsōt̄ηs*; but, as Ast says, we should expect *taīv̄ta* (as indicated C: *On taīv̄dōn̄ ap̄ ēstiv̄, η d̄ ὅς, taīv̄ta tā lōa kai aīrā tō lōov̄*); and *taīv̄ta* would give a satisfactory sense. Mr. Archer-Hind seems to deplore any 'alteration of the text,' but there are worse things than the alteration of the text. The explanation offered by Olympiodoros of *aīrā tā lōa* is pronounced stuff by Ast, readily accepted by Wagner, set aside by Geddes, who in retaining *aīrā tā lōa* says, "It is probable that *aīrā tā lōa* is plural, as referring to more than one application of the one standard of comparison *aīrā tō lōov̄*," whereas Olympiodoros considered it to express "the varying results of the application to different minds," in spite of the personal argument of *soi*. Stallbaum adduces as a parallel, Parmen. 129 B: *aīrā tā ðōmōta*, but I cannot see the appositeness of the parallel, as the Parmenides, on any theory, represents a more advanced stage. Mr. Archer-Hind's note is fuller and more decided, but not more satisfactory, than Dr. Geddes'.

B. L. G.

Studies, Literary and Historical, in the Odes of Horace. By A. W. VERRALL. 196 pp. Macmillan.

The following is a list of the seven essays contained in this volume: (1) Melpomene; (2) Murena; (3) The Historical Poems and the Arrangement of the Three Books; (4) Lamia; (5) Quam Tiberis lavit; (6) Venus and Myrtale; (7) Euterpe.

Of these studies, which are full of interest as well as of novelties for the student of Horace, the most important—certainly the longest, and that which proposes the largest number of new explanations—is the second. If the views here expressed are right, then much in the current exegesis of Horace will have to be changed. Mr. Verrall assumes that the tragic event of the conspiracy and death of Murena gave coloring to, and is often referred to in the first three books of the Odes; therefore, Melpomene is invoked in III 30.

This L. Licinius Varro Murena, brother of Proculeius and brother-in-law of Maecenas, fell heir to the property of M. Terentius Varro, the great scholar and antiquary. To Murena is (as is generally admitted) addressed II 10, and he is referred to by name in III 19, *da puer auguris Murenae*; and Sat. I 5, 38, *Murena praebente domum*. In II 18, Attalus means Varro, and the heir referred to, Murena. Maecenas has divulged the secret of the government's knowledge of the conspiracy to Terentia; therefore, III 2, 25, 'est et fideli tuta silentio merces,' and II 10, 16, *bene mutuum fidum pectus amorphibus*. In III 19, the banquet is supposed to be held at Murena's house at Reate

(cf. *Paelignis frigoribus*); 'lunae novae' refers to the decoration worn by senators on their shoes, and which the banqueters bring along for Murena, and thus earn their cask of wine. In the *Titanomachia* III 4, Apollo is Tiberius, and the Titans are the conspirators. Finally, this Murena is not the A. Terentius Varro Murena mentioned in the *Fasti* as consul for a short while in the beginning of the year 23, for Dio Cassius says that the conspiracy took place in the year 22. Consequently, the three books cannot have been published in 23, the true date being 19. These are the most important theories brought forth.

Passing over the question of chronology, and of the identity of the man whom all the Latin historians call Varro Murena, or Murena simply, and not Licinius, one is at once impressed with the fact that the theme Murena once set wherever it is only possible, and in cases where it would seem impossible, Horace is supposed to be making reference to it. Especially is this the case in those odes where the connection of thought has been somewhat difficult to see. So, e. g., it is not strange that the ode III 19 should have caused trouble to Mr. Verrall, and made him seek a different explanation from the one generally received; the abrupt change at 'da puer auguris' is unquestionably difficult. But when as alternative one is asked to look upon luna nova as the newly acquired senatorial badge, even when this is defended by II 18, 16, 'novaeque pergunt interire lunae,' and II 11, 10, 'neque uno luna rubens nitet vultu,' one naturally hesitates. Without taking luna in any other than its ordinary sense, the ode certainly can be explained just as plausibly, and that, too, without supposing the shift of scene. Again, in discussing IV 6, and showing that it cannot be looked upon as a prelude to the *Carmen Saeculare* Apollo is identified with Tiberius, and Achilles with Murena (both gratuitous assumptions, also made in III 4), and the reader is referred to III 19, where 'genus Aeaci' (Achilles) is paralleled with Murena. That is, 'genus Aeaci' occurs in what the person addressed is telling about, and Murena (according to Mr. Verrall) in what the poem says he is silent about. But the person addressed is speaking of Inachus and Codrus as well; yet all this shows that Horace couples Achilles with Murena, and Horace's readers remembered it, no doubt, just as they remembered that in III 4 Apollo was Tiberius, and the Titans the conspirators. In exactly the same way the reader of the *Satires* remembered, on reading Ode III 19, quo praebente domum, the accidental use of the same phrase with Murena as subject in Sat. I 5, 38, and at once associated the former with Murena too. One might feel tempted to ask how Horace was to have expressed the thought, if he had not been thinking of Sat. I 5, 38 at all. If he constantly has Murena's conspiracy and death before him in the Odes, the poet certainly has been eminently successful in obscuring his true meaning. The third essay attempts to prove that the arrangement of the odes is the historical one; that even if the Odes were not all written in the order in which they occur in our collection, they are consecutive in subject: this shows itself even in the sequence of seasons from ode to ode. Of course, there are seeming exceptions, but these are accounted for. Such are I 3, 24, 29; II 4. In the fourth, the *Lamia* of III 17, 'Aeli vetusto nobilis ab Lamo,' is supposed to be a slave of Horace's, the same steward to whom is addressed Ep. I 14. The fifth calls attention to the deeper significance of the words 'quam Tiberis lavit,' in II 2, for the Roman, who knew the danger from inundations. The

sixth treats of the erotic poems and defends Horace, rescuing him from the inconsistency of being both a moral reformer and a libertine; especially is it emphasized that reference is sometimes had to the married state, a fact that seems to have escaped commentators generally. This defense is as it should be; Horace is not so wicked as he has been represented, and in some of those odes in which he hurts our sense of what is morally right, there can be no doubt that it is not Horace who speaks. But then there are places where Horace, as Horace, is to us more than indiscreet, whatever may have been the views of the writer of III 1-6; and even Mr. V. will not assert that all is in good taste. It is, perhaps, as easy to err in trying to defend him as morally good from our standpoint, as in setting him down as a profligate hypocrite. The seventh essay deals with questions of metre, especially the care exhibited by Horace in the treatment of the last syllable of each line, as well as of each stanza.

On the whole, these studies will be read by every student of H. not without profit. They are written in a style that makes them interesting to the reader, even where the subject treated may not be. If one cannot agree with all the views expressed in the first three essays, they are certainly very suggestive, and all of them are of value in the study and proper understanding of the Odes.

EDW. H. SPIEKER.

Calpurnii et Nemesiani Bucolica recensuit HENRICUS SCHENKL. Lipsiae,
1885.

In the preface Schenkl brings forward new grounds for ascribing the *Laus Pisonis* to Calpurnius, and for assuming the date of its composition to have been before that of the Eclogues, of which the third, on account of certain metrical peculiarities, may be regarded as the earliest. A careful examination is made of the dependence of Calpurnius on earlier poets, and the manner of his borrowing. Here much discrimination is shown. Some evidence of a direct imitation of Theocritus is adduced, but the possibility of some lost Latin poem forming the medium between Calpurnius and Theocritus is not denied. Of other Greek poets there is little trace of imitation. Vergil and Ovid are extensively copied; Catullus, Horace, Tibullus and Propertius to a much less degree. The correspondences with the latter poet are confined to the fourth book. The *Aetna* and *Culix* were also known to Calpurnius, and small borrowings are noted from Seneca and Petronius; but whether correspondences with Columella, Lucan and Persius are due to borrowing, and which was the borrower in each instance, is less clear. A direct influence of Calpurnius upon Statius is stoutly claimed, Haupt to the contrary notwithstanding.

The art of Nemesianus is next discussed, and some interesting statistics are given of his use of elision. Direct imitation of Theocritus is denied, Ecl. IV 21 ff. being drawn rather from Ovid *Ars Am.* II 113 ff., than from Theocritus XXIII 28 ff. Nemesianus is shown to be a more wholesale and clumsy borrower than Calpurnius, often appropriating entire verses with little or no change. Among the poets whom he has plundered are Vergil, Horace, Tibullus, Propertius, Ovid—the *Copa* and *Ciris* and *Carmina Einsiedlensis*—Seneca and Calpurnius.

The sources of the text of these two authors are next examined. The MSS

divide themselves into two classes. The first class, which is free from gaps or any considerable interpolations, is represented by the codd. Neapolitanus and Gadianus and two other MSS now lost. The second class, in which either all the poems are ascribed to Calpurnius or no author is given, finds its best representative in the Codex Parisinus 8049.

The text of the *Bucolica*, which is very handsomely printed, deviates in not a few passages from that of Baehrens, to its advantage, and the critical apparatus is much more complete. Not the least valuable feature of the edition are the carefully prepared indices at the end of the volume: I. Index Auctorum, Imitatorum, Locorum similium; II. Index Verborum quae in Calpurnii et Nemesiani carminibus leguntur; III. Index rei grammaticae et metriceae. A similar edition of the minor works ascribed to Vergil is a great desideratum.

M. WARREN.¹

Livy, Books XXIII and XXIV, edited with Introduction and Notes, by G. C. MACAULAY. With maps. London, Macmillan & Co., 1885.

This edition forms a worthy companion to Capes' edition of Books XXI and XXII. The introductions treating of the text and the sources of the narrative are clearly written, and include all that a school-boy need know. The orthography is good, except that we everywhere find *quum*. The text is based upon that of Madvig's third edition, but in quite a number of instances the editor has ventured to differ from Madvig, and in the notes has clearly stated his reason for so differing, see e. g. the very good note on XXIII 1, 3, defending the reading *urbem excessissent*. The notes on many of the chapters of Book XXIV are somewhat meagre, and syntactical peculiarities of Livy are often left unnoticed or insufficiently explained. A useful index of proper names closes the volume.

M. W.

Elementary Classics. Eutropius adapted for the use of beginners, with Notes, Exercises and Vocabularies, by W. WELCH and C. G. DUFFIELD. London, Macmillan & Co., 1884.

The text of Eutropius has been much abridged and simplified by the omission of difficult passages and unusual constructions, and the result is an easy reader for beginners, embracing in thirty-two pages a summary of Roman history from the founding of the city down to the accession of Augustus. On this are founded seventy-seven exercises made up of simple sentences. Brief notes follow, and a vocabulary, arranged in the order of the text. Although many of the quantities are marked, both short and long, more are left unmarked, and apparently no principle is followed; e. g. we find *dēcēdō* but *dēpopulor*, *fācio* but *admiratio*. The nominative *cēter* will be found in vocabulary XXXIX without remark.

M. W.

¹ PROFESSOR WARREN'S notice of Schenkl's Calpurnius and Nemesianus was in type when a much fuller and more detailed review was received from the eminent specialist Professor ROBINSON ELLIS. Professor Warren at once offered to withdraw his notice, but as Professor Ellis' review will appear in another volume, the Editor has preferred to retain this independent tribute to an excellent piece of work.—B. L. G.

REPORTS.

ARCHIV FÜR LATEINISCHE LEXICOGRAPHIE UND GRAMMATIK. Zweiter Jahr-gang. Heft 2.

On pp. 157-202 Thielmann continues his discussion of "Habere mit dem Infinitiv und die Entstehung des romanischen Futurums." He shows what causes operated to bring about the extinction of the future-active forms like *credam*, *amabit*, which carried with it the loss of the passive forms like *credar*, *amabitur*. The forms in *-am* perished first, by reason of their identity with the pres. subj. This identity led to the use of *respondeam* for *respondebo*, *perspiciat* for *perspiciet*, etc. Moreover, the forms *credes*, *credet*, were confused in the vulgar pronunciation with *credis*, *credit*, and the tendency in Romance to accent the vowel of the ending, cf. Ital. *vendēte*, contributed strongly to the disintegration. It was natural that the present, as the tense in more frequent use, should maintain itself. To obviate confusion, the vulgar language coined forms like *credebo*, and Sergius Explan., in Donat., G. L. IV, p. 552, 13 ff., warns against the use of *legebo* and *cognoscebis*. In archaic Latin the same tendency is already apparent in forms like *audibo*, *dormibo*. Even these forms were threatened with destruction by the spread of Betacismus; whereby *amavit* was pronounced like *amabit* and vice versa. Hence, in Salvianus, gub. d. 5, 61, we find *liberandus a deo non eris* (= *liberaberis*), *nisi te ipse damnaveris*. In Africa, especially where betacism flourished, the need of new substitutes for the future made itself early felt. Future-perfect forms like *amaveris* could not be used, because here too there was confusion with the perf. subj., and in the contracted form with the imperf. subj. *amares*. Hence it was necessary to resort to some periphrastic form like *amans ero* (of which, however, Thielmann is able to give no example, although forms like *amandus ero* occur for the passive), or the use of *facere*, *reddere*, *dare*, with a perfect participle—e. g., *effectum dabo*=*efficiam*. Much more important, however, are the locutions made up of an auxiliary verb with an infinitive. The following possibilities of expression presented themselves: 1. *esse*. In English we have *I am to go*, in Ital. *essendo per amare*=*amaturus*. In Fredegar, 4, 40, Thielmann finds a single doubtful example, *pollicetur esset implere* for *esse impleturum*. 2. *habere*. Analogues to the use of *habere* in other languages are given. 3. *posse*. This use is well known after *sperare*; it is extended in the Scriptores Historiae Augustae, but seems not to have taken a deep hold of the language. 4. *debere*, as in Sardinian. 5. *velle*, as in Wallachian. A vulgar tendency is noted, as in Sulpicius, Cic. ad. fam. 4, 5, 4, to say *volo tibi commemorare* for *commemorabo*. Other examples not in 1 pers. sing. are given from the later Latin. 6. *incipere*. 7. *ire*, *venire*, with supine or infin.; cf. *ultum ire*, Sall. Jug. 68, 1, and the inf. fut. pass. with *iri*. In Romance dialects *venire* and *vado* are thus used; cf. Fr. *je vais dire*. Of these numerous possibilities of expressing the future, the construction with *habere* seems to have proved the strongest. Porphyrius on Horace, Epist. 2, 1, 17, has *nasci habere*=*natum iri*.

Thielmann gives in detail the progress of the idiom in Cyprian, Novatianus, Arnobius and Lactantius in the translations of ecclesiastical works and of the Bible, as well as in the *Acta Martyrum*. The use by Servius (*Aen.* 3, 457; 5, 712) of *velle habet* for *volet*, may prove a valuable indication of his African descent, for this usage of *habere* down to the second half of the fourth century is mainly found in African Latinity. The latter part of Thielmann's exhaustive article is devoted to showing how, chiefly through the influence of theological writers, the idiom spread to other parts of the Roman empire. Down to Augustine only verbs of the third and fourth conjugation form their future with *habeo*, but he uses *habet orare* for *orabit*, *respondere habet* for *respondebit*. The first forerunner of the Romance conditional is found in a work whose author is unknown, but who was probably an African of the fifth century. Migne, Vol. 39, col. 2214, 6, *sanare te habebat deus, si confitereris*. This leads to an excursus on the forms of unreal condition like *facturus eram*, and *facturus fui* for *fecissetem*, and *facturus fueram* and *fuisse*, in which many valuable facts respecting the classical usage are brought out. The fact that the Italians Cassiodorus and Venantius prefer *habui* to *habebam* with the infinitive in these conditional clauses is significant, inasmuch as the Italian forms its conditional by preference with *habui*. Latin examples of the periphrastic formation of the future with *habeo* are given down to the ninth century. In this century, in the Strassburg oath, we find the first example of the Romance future, *salvarai = salvare habeo*, *prindrai = prendere habeo*. The whole investigation, which extends over a period of a thousand years of continuous development, is a model as to method, and the writer is justified in the emphasis which he lays upon the importance of the much-neglected ecclesiastical writings, both for the Latinist and the Romance scholar.

Fritz Schöll discusses, pp. 203-218, "Alte Probleme." 1. Gerundium, concerning whose real meaning there has been so much disagreement, he regards as having simply the force of 'active' as opposed to supinum in the sense of 'passive.' In formation it is like *crepundia* from *crepere*. 2. The difficulties of the passage, *De Domo*, IX 24, he removes by considering 'leges Sempronias (per senatum decretas) rescidisti' an interpolation. 3. *opus est—usus est*. He seeks to prove that the construction of *usus est* with the abl. is really the earlier, and that *opus est* takes the abl. by the working of analogy, so that the case is not an instrumental nor a pure ablative. 4. *refert—interest*. The *rē* of *refert* is regarded not as a dat. or acc., but an abl., after the analogy of expressions like '*ex re esse*', '*ex re facere*', i. e., *refert* = 'vom Standpunkt deiner Sache trägt es etwas aus' oder 'bringt es etwas ein.' The abl. after *interest* is due to false analogy. An attempt is made to explain the genitive construction after *interest* by supposing that in sentences like Cicero, *pro Mur.* II 4, *quantum salutis communis intersit*, *Epist.* IV 10, 2, *multum interest rei familiaris tuae*, etc., the genitive originally depended on *quantum*, *multum*, and was afterward regarded as independent of them. The last word, we think, yet remains to be said on this idiom.

E. Lübbert, pp. 219-227, contributes some interesting "Paralipomena zur Geschichte der lateinischen Tempora und Modi." Noticing the frequency with which in laws after the period of the Gracchi such double expressions of

time as *qui fecit, fecerit, qui emit emerit* occur, he seeks to explain the difficult passage, pro Sestio, 64, 133, *qui legem meam contemnat, quae dilucide velat, gladiatores biennio, quo quis petierit aut petiturus sit, dare*, by supposing that the law itself read, *ne quis biennio, quo petitur petierit petiturus sit, gladiatorum munus edito*, the *petiturus sit* being added to include the last portion of the *biennium* and to prevent any legal quibbling. Lübbert shows that forms in *sim* like *faxim, capsim, servassim*, etc., always refer to events or actions conceived of as taking place in the future, all the alleged cases where a past action is implied being now satisfactorily disposed of by critics. *Coromagister*, in the inscription VITA DONATO CORO MAGISTRO, is explained by Wölfflin to be a hybrid after the analogy of *κορωπλάστης*.

Usener, pp. 228-232, develops the technical juristic meaning of *precator*. The *precator* stood to the slave in the same attitude as the *patronus* to the *cliens* or *libertus*. A similar Greek use of *παράκλητος* is illustrated by several passages.

E. Hoffmann takes *speculoclarus*, in Most. 645, to be a compound adjective == 'spiegelhell.'

Wölfflin, pp. 233-254, tries to answer for different periods of Latinity the question "Was heißt bald . . . bald?" The early Latin seems to be poor in expressions of temporal corresponsion. It has no equivalent for the *μέν . . . δέ* so much used in Greek. Plautus, Curc. 63, uses *alias . . . alias*, but Terence, Eun. 714, already has the Ciceronian *modo . . . modo*, which Priscian explains by *nunc . . . nunc*. Cato uses *repente . . . repente* and *alteras . . . alteras . . . alteras*, for *alias*, p. 85, 3, Jordan. Rare examples of *dum . . . dum* are given. *Alias . . . alias* is used by Varro, and, what is stranger, by Caesar, although Sallust rejected it, and it continued to be used by Festus, Vitruvius, Seneca, Pliny, and Gellius, and even Quintilian. Occasional instances are pointed out in the jurists and late writers. The examples of *modo . . . modo* in all periods after Cicero are, of course, very numerous. Cicero prefers it in his speeches and letters, yielding the preference in his rhetorical works to *tum . . . tum*. Noticeable in Sallust is the chiastic arrangement *citus modo modo tardus incessus*, which found few imitators. Ovid heaps up the *modo's* to excess. Vergil avoids them entirely.

Tum . . . tum seems first to have been used by Cicero == the earlier *dum . . . dum* (Cornificius, 3, 24, had used *modo . . . tum*), but it is remarkable how little acceptance it met with until Quintilian, who uses it fourteen times. Neither Pliny nor Tacitus followed their teacher in this usage. African writers indulged more frequently in its use. Apuleius is the first to use *tunc . . . tunc*, but *tum . . . tum* never became a favorite usage.

Nunc . . . nunc seems to have been introduced by Lucretius, and extended in use by Vergil and subsequent poets. Livy introduced it in prose, using it more frequently than *modo . . . modo*; but Tacitus uses *nunc . . . nunc* but once, *modo . . . modo* 25 times. Other interesting statistics are given.

Interdum . . . interdum first found in Cicero, Epist. ad Fam. 7, 17, 1, is followed by many examples from other writers.

iam . . . iam is introduced by Vergil, but never became popular in prose or poetry.

saepe . . . saepe is an innovation of Ovid which found slight following.

Celsus begins in his fifth book, for variety's sake, to use *nunnunquam* . . . *nonnunquam*, but this was too clumsy for general adoption.

aliquando . . . *aliquando* found much more favor with writers from Seneca on, and is especially frequent in the grammarians and some of the Church Fathers, although Hieronymus did not allow himself to use it. *aliquoties* . . . *aliquoties* comes into use much later.

alicubi . . . *elicubi* is almost confined to Seneca, its inventor. Examples are given also of *alibi* . . . *alibi*, *quando(que)* . . . *quando(que)*, *interim* . . . *interim*, *subinde* . . . *subinde*, *plerumque* . . . *plerumque*, and *mox* . . . *mox*, all of which are for the most part late. The article, which is very suggestive, concludes with a mention of some variations such as *modo* . . . *saepius*, *modo* . . . *rursus*, *modo*, *modo* . . . *tum*, etc.

Several instances of the form *carrum* are given from glosses.

Paul Geyer, pp. 255-266, "Die Hisperica Famina." This article is devoted to an exposition of the peculiarities of the remarkable work first published under the above title in Angelo Mai's "Classici Auctores," Vol. V, pp. 479-500. Many indications are discovered of a Spanish origin. The date of composition is left undetermined. The reference to rhetorical schools, to which the work evinces a violent hostility, makes plausible the supposition that it belongs to the sixth or seventh century.

Pp. 267-275 contain Addenda lexicis latinis from *Barriclus-Curvedo*. Konrad Hoffman, in a note, defends the form *acieris*, Paulus, p. 10, 1, from which come Fr. *acier*, Ital. *acciaio*, Span. *acer*, against *aceris* found in Gloss. Philox, pp. 11, 32. The Cod. Sangallensis 912, A 82, has *acerlis*, which also favors *acieris*.

In pp. 276-288, Gröber continues his "Vulgärlateinische Substrata romanischer Wörter" from *über, ebris-fiticum, ficitum = ficatum*. A fourth specimen of the projected Thesaurus follows, which is less interesting than any of those preceding, being mostly devoted to *abba*, *abbas*. The rest of the number is devoted to short "Miscellen," including a short extract from the Phillipps Glossary, by Robinson Ellis, of which a larger specimen is presented to the readers of this Journal in the current number, and to book notices of works appearing in 1884, 1885.

M. WARREN.

FLECKEISEN'S JAHRBUCHER FÜR CLASSISCHE PHILOLOGIE. 1883.¹

Fascicle I.

I. Zu den griechischen elegikern. This is a review by W. Clemm (Giessen) of the fourth edition of Bergk's second volume of the 'Poetae Lyrici Graeci.' It is a great misfortune that B. did not live to complete this volume himself; for he had kept fully abreast of the great mass of literature which continued to appear on the Greek elegiac poets since 1866. There is little to criticise in the text of Kallinos, Tyrtaios or Mimnermos, as B. has edited them. C. places Kallinos in the second half of the seventh cent. and Archilochos before him, thus reversing B.'s order. B. does not adopt several proposed emendations for the text of Solon, and against the new fever for responses and symmetry in Solon's poems, he takes decided ground. Upon Theognis, however, more

¹ See A. J. P. VI, p. 386.

has been written than upon all other Greek elegiac writers. It is and will be a disputed question, in spite of the most acute research, just how much of a Theognis collection is genuine. Thus, in fragments 467-474, 667-682, 1345-1350 we have B. ascribing them to Euenos. Leutsch ascribes the first to Panyasis and the second to Euenos, while Hiller, reasoning from the Euboean character of v. 672, ascribes vv. 891-894 to the same source. The question regarding the lemma (*Ξενοφῶντος*), vv. 183-192, is still open. Clemm, following neither Sitzler nor Leutsch, but Bergk, explains it thus: A selection was made from Xenophon by Stobaios; this dropped out later in some way; after it came (*Ἀριστοτέλους*) ἐκ τοῦ περὶ (*εὐγενείας*). The beginning and end of this title were then lost. *Ξενοφῶντος* fell into the place of *Ἀριστοτέλους*; in place of *εὐγενείας* came the initial word of the Aristotelian quotation. The review closes with a notice of B.'s treatment of the epigram found in §289 of Demosth. *περὶ τοῦ στεφάνου*.

2. Zu der schrift vom Staat der Athener. Schroeder, Berlin. In 3, 12 omit *ἀδίκως* both times.

3. Zu Empedokles. Blass, Kiel. Four critical and exegetical notes.

4. A review, by Ch. Muff (Stettin), of Wecklein's Chorgesänge des Aeschylos. This follows Wecklein's entirely new treatment of the Aeschylean choral songs step by step. W. takes up first the choral songs that have no antistrophes, then the ephymnia, and finally the division and the relation of the parts of the choral songs. As to W.'s work on the ephymnia, Muff gives Kirchhoff the honor of all originality; as to rhythmic ephymnia, Kruse, in his commentary to the Hiketides, was the first to explain them. W.'s rule that the strophal and antistrophal of the ephymnia are always sung by the same person or persons is not correct. They *may* be, and in Prom. 574-608 they are not. Muff's own views are more given in his 'de choro Persarum.'

5. Zu Euripides. F. L. Lentz, Königsberg. Hartung and Kirchhoff have omitted *τι φῶ* in Eurip. Hel. 656, because these words destroy the stichomythia. G. Hermann arranged the text in lines 704-705 so that *τι φῆς* made a line by itself. L. points out that there is no stichomythia near v. 656 for it to destroy, and proposes a better analysis of the thought in vv. 704, 705 than Hermann's, so that *τι φῆς* may be incorporated into a full line. The general drift of the article, however, is to show the superiority of Hermann's work in Euripides, and to answer the many objections against the texts of Kirchhoff, Nauck and Dindorf by inviting closer attention to Hermann's.

6. A note zur biographie des Thukydides. Hirschwälder, Breslau.

7. Der letzte kampf der Achäer gegen Nabis. F. Ruhl, Königsberg.

8. Epigraphisches. P. Cauer, Berlin. A note to correct a statement, p. 319, in Vol. IV Leipziger Studien; for *παραγένωντι*, the proposed reading, substitute *παραγγέλλωντι*. In the Revue Archéologique, VIII, p. 469, for *τιμάζει* read *τετμάζει*.

9. Zu Florus. Teuber, Eberswalde. In I 37 read *venere illi*; *quanta et in barbaris animi alti vestigia*, etc.

10. A review by Meltzer of Pais's La Sardegna prima del dominio romano. The book discusses early Egyptian, Libyan and Phoenician migrations to

Sardinia. The review is very favorable. Meltzer takes occasion, however, to show at length where he disagrees with G. F. Unger on the same subject.

11. *Zum Truculentus des Plautus.* Dzitzko, Breslau. An explanation of the superscription to act II, sc. 1. Whether the VL after the period shall be taken for a numeral is discussed. Schöll properly compares this with LX at the end of act II, sc. 1 in *Trin.*, but considers the V and the X to be musical symbols. D. takes both for numerals and shows with one parallel instance that VL can = 45. Besides, in the Cod. Vet. this very act has 45 lines. Three notes on *Trin.* (vv. 2, 248 and 882) end the article.

12. *Zur kritik des Propertius.* Rossberg, Norden. From a study of the five MSS (AFDVN), R. comes to a series of seven conclusions, the most important of which is that N has a far greater value than Bährens has recently given it in his edition.¹ R. then adds his critical and exegetical notes on I 1, 7; I 3, 37; I 4, 7; I 6, 24; I 7, 16; I 8, 40; I 9, 6; I 11, 6; I 19, 10; I 20, 25 ff.; II 1, 6; II 3, 22 and 25 other passages.

13. *Ein druckfehler bei Ovidius.* Brandt, Heidelberg. The passage is in Merkel's edition; *Trist.* IV 10, 107.

14. *Zu Xenophon's Hellenika.* H. Zurborg, Zerbst. Critical notes on I 1, 36; II 1, 15; II 3, 19; II 3, 40.

Fascicle 2.

15. *Anzeige von A. Boetticher's Olympia,* by J. Classen, Hamburg. Since Classen reviewed Curtius' *Peloponnesus* (Vol. 67 Jgbr.) he has himself been in Olympia (April, 1880). The ground is familiar to him, and it is with a positive sense of joy that, comparing his impressions of the "Olympia" with his recollections of the place, he gives Bötticher's work a hearty indorsement. In 1875 B. was sent out to Olympia with Prof. G. Hirschfeld to conduct the archaeological and technical work in connection with the excavations. It is as a result of the sympathetic encouragement of E. Curtius, Hirschfeld and Weil that this volume has appeared. The introduction (pp. 3-11) explains the standpoint which the author takes for his work. The next division (pp. 15-25) treats of the geographical position and surroundings of Olympia; another is devoted to the decline of Olympia and the late history of the plain (pp. 29-45). Very interesting is the chapter on the history of the rediscovery of Olympia (pp. 49-72). The following chapter (pp. 79-154) on the festivals in Olympia is somewhat out of connection with the main purpose of the work—which is to show the results of the German excavations in Olympia. Then follows the most important part of the work—namely, an historical account of the scenes through which Olympia passed from the earliest time to the Roman hegemony. This period he divides into four parts, running the history of Olympia through them in succession. Pages 243-337 are devoted to the period when the city

¹ See Robinson Ellis in A. J. P. I 389. It is of interest to quote what E. says (p. 401): "The conclusion at which I have arrived is that N is *not* an interpolated MS; that it stands on a level, as regards sincerity, with Bährens' four primary codices; that the same arguments which are used to prove it interpolated might be turned against a variety of readings in these four MSS; that, as a corollary to this, the archetype which Bährens would reconstitute from these four is only partially to be accepted." Rossberg does not agree with E. as to the freedom of N from interpolations, but in the practical conclusion he is at one with him. No reference is made to E.'s article.—B. L. G.

was at her highest—from the Persian to the Makedonian war. The whole work, in conclusion, meets with Classen's heartiest approbation and his warmest recommendation.

16. Zu Sophokles' Antigone. Petri, Höxter. A critical note on 150 ff.

17. Die *ἀπαγωγή* in mordprocessen. M. Sorof, Coslin. We have but few means for arriving at a conception of the *ἀπαγωγή*—namely, in Lys. c. Antiphon V, Lysias XIII, and Demosthenes XXIII. Arguing from the fact that in Agoratum the eleven cannot take cognizance of the accusation for murder before the clause *ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ* is added, and from the fact that in Ant. V the accused does not complain of being brought up before the eleven because the clause is not inserted, but because the trial was held *ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ* and not *ἐν ἵπαιθρῷ*, S. comes to the conclusion that the eleven did not have cognizance of all murder trials at Lysias' time, and that at the time of Antiphon the clause *ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ* was not essential. The speech of Antiphon on the murder of Herodes is no proof that at his time trials for simple murder could come off before the eleven. If a murderer was conveyed to prison, another charge (thievery) must be made against him, so that he might fall under the *νόμος κακοθύων*. Later the competence of the eleven was extended to such cases wherein the charge was for simple murder, but the murderer was caught *ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ*.

18. Zu Timon von Phlius. F. Kern, Berlin.

19. Das halsband der Harmonia und die krone der Ariadne. W. Schwartz, Posen. The necklace of Harmonia was eventually sunk in a Greek fountain. Hodie cerni dicitur, quod si quis attractaverit, dicunt solem offendit et tempestatem oriri. This gives S. occasion to treat the whole matter on the basis of comp. mythology. The necklace is compared with the Nibelungenhort, which also, being of baneful magic powers, was sunk to rid the world of it. The necklace of Harmonia is, further, the same as the rainbow—the girdle of the heavenly waters. The appearance of the rainbow is also baneful. Sophokles calls it *օιράνιον ἄχος*. In Iliad P 548 we read of it as a *τέρας η πολέμου η καὶ χειμῶνος δυσθαλπέος*. As the Nibelungenhort lies in the water and that of Andvari is rescued from the water, so the necklace remains sunk there, while Theseus brings up the crown of Ariadne. S. then goes on to show that all these treasures are connected with the storms in the waters of the clouds. These treasures, as well as Indra's bow, the water-ring in Switzerland, the crown of the goddess of the spring-sun of the Harz, all come from some common original source.

20. Zu Lucianos. J. Sommerbrodt, Breslau. Fortsetzung von Jahrgang 1878, pp. 561–564. Critical notes.

21. Zu Cicero's reden gegen Verres. E. Grunauer, Winterthur. Note on IV, §41.

22. Quisquiliae Plautinae. Th. Hasper, Dresdae. Critical notes on Men. 519 and Aulularia.

23. M. Wetzel. Anzeige v. H. Kluges consecutio temporum im latein. Kluge has given little that is new, although in a great deal that he gives he seems correct enough. Gossrau (lateinische sprachlehre) and Wetzel himself (de cons. temp. Ciceroniana capita duo) have as good as exhausted the field.

24. Zu Seneca. E. Heydenreich, Freiberg. On de remediis fortitorum.
 25. Inschrift von Metapontion. E. Hiller, Halle.

Fascicle 3.

26. Zu Sophokles. J. Renner, Zittau. Ten critical notes, seven on Philoktetes, two on Trachiniai, one on Aias.

27. Die vergiftung mit stierblut im classischen altertum. W. Roscher, Wurzen. R. shows, with eight classified instances, the general belief in this kind of poisoning; shows, however, that to-day physicians, and especially American physicians, give ox-blood to their patients at times, and suggests that the ancient superstition may have arisen from some one's having drunk the blood of an ox suffering from inflammation of the spleen.

28. Utra futuri forma oratores attici uti maluerint, $\xi\omega$ an $\sigma\chi\hat{\eta}\sigma\omega$? E. R. Schultze, Bautzen. "I have found $\xi\omega$ to have been the much more common form and $\sigma\chi\hat{\eta}\sigma\omega$ to have been almost entirely unused excepting in $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\chi\epsilon\nu$." A statistical table follows.

29. Die gegner in der ersten rede des Isaios. Albrecht, Berlin.

30. Die weihinschrift des Dianahaines von Aricia. This is directed against O. Seck's article, Rh. Mus. XXXVII 15-25, who dates the inscription 381 B. C. Beloch gives it a much older date. It has to do rather with the Latin confederation than with the Alban, and all the states mentioned in it must have been independent; for the dictator of Latium is named at the very beginning. Pometia, however, which is included among the states, lost its independence about the beginning of the Volscian war. That would place the inscription not far from 490 B. C.

31. Zu Justinus. A. Eussner, Würzburg, and Sprenger, Northeim.

32. Th. Vogel's anzeige von K. Sittl's localen verschiedenheiten der lat. spr. This book, which is, upon the whole, rather new in its field, makes a good beginning, and it is to be hoped other investigators will be attracted to continue what it has begun.

(13.) Ein druckfehler bei Ovidius. Goebel, Fulda. Two additional internal reasons in support of Art. 13 above.

33. Pseudoboethiana. Stangl, München. Critical notes. Continued in fascicle 4.

34. Zu Cicero's Brutus. A. Fleckeisen, Dresden. Seven critical notes. A continuation is promised.

35. Zu Gellius. H. Rönsch, Lobenstein. Critical notes on XVI 7.

36. Sallustius und Aurelius Victor. Th. Opitz, Dresden. This comes in support of Wölfflin, Rh. Mus. XXIX 285 ff., showing how much Aur. Victor imitated the style of Sallust. O. carries his instances beyond the 11th chap. of the Caesar, where Wölfflin stopped. O. shows, further, that this imitation went so far that Aur. Vic. copied and used over and over certain pet words and phrases found in Sallust.

37. Zenon von Kition. F. Susemihl, Greifswald. A note to Rohde; see Jahrb. 1882, 773 ff. and 831 ff.

38. Zu Livius. Eisen, Lörrach. On XXII 3, 6, read *Faesulas cedens* for *F. petens*.

Fascicle 4.

39. Studien zu Babrios und den Aisopeia. O. Crusius, Leipzig.

40. Zur erklärung und kritik der homerischen gedichte. A. Gemoll, Wohlau. Von homerischen zahlen. First, ships of twenty and of fifty oars are not pure invention. In v. 322 we read, "we likened it [the Kyklops' club] to the mast of a twenty-oared vessel"; this plainly implies the existence of such vessels. So do A 309, β 212, δ 669. Mention of fifty-oared boats occurs in B 719 and II 170, also in B 662; for from γ 7, where 9×500 Pylians sacrifice with Nestor, we may infer they were really 90×50 . γ 7 was composed before B 510, for in the latter, ships of 120 men occur, which number must be mentally carried on to v. 719. Had this catalogue been before the composer of γ 7, he would have given figures differing from those actually given. Secondly, the number 9. The arrows of the god fell 9 days (A 53), nine heralds arrange the Achaeans (B 96), nine battle-judges arrange the Phaiakians (θ 258). See also Z 174, I 474, M 25, ω 60. Here 9 is an imaginary number. But where burial is alluded to (Ω 664, 610, 107, 413) it is not so; we have traces of a very ancient usage. It is historically the same as *ēvara* and the *sacrum novendiale*. Finally, the 118 goats (ι 159) and the 118 suitors (π 247).

41. Zu Theognis. Ziegler, Stuttgart. Critical notes in continuation of Jhbb. 1882, p. 447.

42. Das thronfolgerecht der spartanischen Kronprinzensöhne (zu Herod. VII 3). G. Heidtmann, Wesel. An argument to prove that the passage (Herod. VII 3) *ἐπει γε καὶ ἐν Σπάρτῃ . . . βασιληγος γίνεσθαι* is the interpolation of a later hand.

43. Zu Platon's apologie des Sokrates. E. Goebel, Fulda. A continuation of Jhbb. 1882, pp. 747-750. Critical notes on §35b through §41b.

44. O. Harnecker's anzeige von C. Jacoby's Anthologie aus den elegikern der Römer. J. has done much better work on his second volume (Tibullus and Propertius) than on the first (Ovid and Catullus). H. questions the real usefulness of the first, therefore. The second is a decided improvement over Schulze. A new edition will give opportunity for many improvements.

45. Zu Ovidius Fasti. W. Gilbert, Dresden. In Jhbb. 1878, p. 784, line 15, verses 803 and 804 are spoken of where G. meant verses 804 and 805. This misprint has given rise to considerable error already.

46. Das fragmentum Cuiacianum des Tibullus. E. Hiller, Halle. This fragment (F) was used by the Italians in the 15th century. Most of its readings, which differ from our best MSS, especially from the Ambrosianus, are brought in from interpolated readings, from old editions and from old collations.

47. B. Dombart's anzeige von Ennodii opera omnia ed. G. Hartel.

48. Zu Livius und Aelius Spartanus. J. Golisch, Schweidnitz. A note on *non utique* in Livy VII 40, 9; and on *post maceriem* (MSS *post maurum*, Peter, *post murum*) Spartanus, Severus XXII 4.

(33.) Pseudoboethiana. Th. Stangl. Continuation from fascicle 3.

49. Wisibada, J. G. Cuno, Graudenz. Von Medem derives this name (mod. Wiesbaden) from the Irish *uisge* = water. C. takes it from the tribal name Usinobates, which is a contraction from Nava (= naba) and ós = supra; so that the name stands for *ósi-noba-tes = supra Navam habitantes. Long o we know passed over, in the old Celtic, to ua, which gives the w sound.

50. Philologische gelegenheitsschriften.

Fascicles 5 u. 6.

51. Die orakelinschriften von Dodona. H. R. Pomtow, Hamburg. This article covers the first 55 pages of this double number, and is mainly devoted to a more intelligent and systematic study of the leaden plates found at Dodona than they received at the hands of Carapanos (*Dodone et ses ruines*, Paris, Hachette et cie., 1878, 2 t.). Carapanos' work has not given to the study of Dodonian antiquities that impetus which they merit. Apart from minor contributions, such as those of Eggers (bull. de corr. hel. Vol. I), of Rangabé (*Parnassos* II 5, p. 399, and *Arch. u. epig. beiträge aus Oest* IV (1880) p. 59) of Garlitt and Schneider (in the same pp. 61-64), we have but three really important treatises on these inscriptions: Wieseler's (*Gött. nachrich.* 1879, 1-79), Bursian (*sitz. ber. d. Münch. Akad.* 1878, *phil.-hist. cl.* 1-29, *nachtr.* p. 224), and Köhler (*der neue reich*, 1879, p. 407 ff.). Pomtow reclassifies the inscriptions, finding as he does no system in Carapanos' classification. The total number (45) which C. gives, he reduces to 41, since some of the plates go together. P. arranges in the first class those questions directed to the oracle by the various Greek states, giving with each inscription the restoration and a commentary where necessary. First come the two plates containing questions asked by Korkyra, then one from Tarentum, another from the Molossae. In the second class are put questions asked by private people. Nos. 6 and 7 are the antiquissimae; after these come the Dorian and Aeolian; with No. 22 begin the Athenian and Ionian. Then follow 13 very fragmentary and illegible inscriptions, of which P. makes the most he can; the four illegible inscriptions are arranged last, and in an appendix come the most recently discovered plates. The second part of the article is devoted to the main discussion: of what significance these inscriptions are for our knowledge of the arrangements of a Dodonian oracle and what place these plates had in it. First, the topography of the country is carefully gone over, and every deduction made which helps toward the reconstruction of the old sacred spot. From Polyb. IV 67 we learn that Dorimachos *κατέσκαψε καὶ τὴν ἱερὰν οἰκίαν*, but from Diidoros that he *τὸ μαντεῖον συλήσας ἐνέπρησε τὸ λερὸν πλῆν τοῦ σηκοῦ*. P. takes the *σηκός* or *μαντεῖον* to be the space—the inner sanctuary—which was surrounded with the famous three tripods. And as to the leaden tablets, a great many of them came from the old archives destroyed by Dorimachos. The location of this archive-chamber P. takes to be one of the two stone buildings erected on the plateau of the temple-enclosure, and never reconstructed in later times. Such a locality we must assume as the place for preservation, and if the building which lay nearer the temple was the *θησαυρός*, then the more remote one was the archive-building or vice versa. When the oracle was restored, the temple only was rebuilt; however, fragments of the old registered plates were found in the other ruins, and they were conveyed to the temple, which was

now used as an archive-building, and in whose ruins Carapanos found them. Here the question-plates were stored up as fast as used, and the older ones (dating from the time of Dorimachos) began to be used over. The broken condition of the old plates is due to his plundering the temple—a condition which compelled the writers who used these plates over to adapt the endings and the beginnings of their lines to the irregularities of the edges.

52. Die einführung der in homerischer zeit noch nicht bekannten opfer in Griechenland. P. Stengel, Berlin. The article has special reference to expiatory and mortuary sacrifices, neither of which S. maintains was known to the Homeric Greeks. To the first belong human sacrifices, and these, says K. F. Hermann, were known to the oldest Greek cultus, beyond all doubt. The first argument is directed against this statement. S. agrees with Hermann that the Phoenicians would have been the people from whom these sacrifices were learned. But the Phoenicians practised them only at the beginning of a great undertaking or upon the opening of a campaign, whereas there is no great concurrent evidence that the Greeks, with all their knowledge of human sacrifices, performed them on these occasions. S. comes to the conclusion that expiatory sacrifices, especially human sacrifices, were borrowed from the Phoenicians, and found entrance into Greece *long after* Homer, when commerce between the two peoples was more active. The second argument touches sacrifices to the dead. S. holds the ground that there is no single instance of Greek sacrifices to the dead where any trace of foreign influence can be discovered; the case of the Scythian Toxaris (Herod. IV 61) being of course totally un-Hellenic. Sacrifices accompanying the taking of oaths take the last three pages of the article. The aim of the entire article is to maintain that modifications in the conceptions of the Hellenic deities are all post-Homeric.

53. Zu Antiphon. E. Albrecht, Berlin. Ten critical and exegetical notes.

54. Zu Archimedes. F. Blass, Kiel. In the Ψαμίτης, L, §9 (II 248 Heiberg), it is proposed to change 'Ακούπατρος το ἀμοῦ πατρός = τοῦ ἡμετέρου πατρός.

55. Die regierungen des Peisistratos. G. F. Unger, Würzburg. U. distinguishes four periods during which Peisistratos controlled Athens:

Oly. 54, 4 = 561, 1st $\frac{1}{2}$ year ; 54, 4 = 560, exile 8 years.

56, 4 = 552, 2d $\frac{1}{2}$ year ; 57, 1 = 552, exile, 1 year.

57, 2 = 551, 3d 7 years ; 58, 4 = 544, exile 7 years.

60, 3 = 537, 4th 9 years; 62, 4 = 528, died.

56. Über den schluss des zweiten Epeisodion in Sophokles' Antigone. F. Kern, Berlin. Mainly a psychological analysis of the entire close of this epeisodion, with an incidental discussion of the question whether v. 572 ought not to be given to Ismene.

57. Philologie und geschichtswissenschaft, von H. Usener. A few objections by F. Heerdegen, Erlangen, to Usener's definition of the relation of philology to historical knowledge and those sciences which are grouped under general psychology.

58. Zu Epikuros brief an Herodotos. F. Bockemüller, Stade.

59. Zu Quintilianus. A. Eussner, Würzburg. In Inst. Oraf. XII 10, 64,

E. would omit *verborum*, because it mars the effect, and can belong to only one member of the comparison.

60. Zu Dionysios von Halikarnasos. Critical notes (7) by L. Sadée, Freiburg im Br.

61. *Δῆματα εἰς τὰ σφαιρικά.* F. Hultsch, Dresden.

62. Zu Ovidius metamorphosen. E. Grunauer, Winterthur. In IX 43, read *pectus* for *pronus*.

63. Zu Cicero's philosophischen schriften. W. Friedrich, Mühlhausen, in Th. Critical Notes.

(21.) Zu Cicero's reden gegen Verres. J. Schlenger, Mainz. Read *aprinum* for *parinum* in IV, §128.

64. W. H. Kolster's anzeigen v. Virgil, with notes by T. L. Papillon.

65. Zu Sallustius. K. Kraut, Blaubeuren. In *hist. fr.* I 56 Kr. read *nimir* securam for *omissa cura*. —

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN. Herausgegeben von Dr. EUGEN KÖLBING. VI Band. Heilbronn, 1883.¹

I.—Noticeable among the articles of this volume is one On the Sources of the Orrmulum, by G. Sarrazin. The starting-point of his investigation is furnished him by the statements of two authorities, White, the editor of the Orrmulum, and Ten Brink. The former says of Orrm: "He borrows copiously from the writings of St. Augustine and Aelfric, and occasionally from those of Beda"; the latter affirms (Early English Literature, p. 194): "Orrm's theological tradition went back to Aelfric and his school. He seems quite at home in Aelfric's writings, as well as in those of Beda and Augustine." Sarrazin sets himself the task of testing the accuracy of these statements, and arrives at the conclusion that Orrm's principal authority is Beda and the homilies of Gregory the Great, but that he may also have consulted the writings of Josephus (Hegesippus) and Isidor. As to any direct influence of Augustine, Jerome or Aelfric, there is no testimony whatsoever. Moreover, Orrm is totally unaffected, not only by the Norman-French language, but also by the influx of foreign theological thought, as represented by Anselm and by Berengarius of Tours.

W. Sattler, Zur englischen Grammatik, IV, discusses the relation of *older* *oldest* to *elder*, *eldest*.

Notes on Macaulay's History, IV, by R. Thum.

G. Sarrazin, in a paper On the Etymology of "Bad," proposes O. E. *gebæded* as its root. It should be observed, however, that the Dictionary of the Philological Society prefers *bæddel*, which Zupitza has suggested as the probable etymon.

The Book Notices contain reviews of Morris' Specimens of Early English, Part I, Zeuner's Die Sprache des Kentischen Psalters, Landmann's Shakspeare and Euphuism, Moltke's Shakespere's Hamlet-Quellen, and Zart's Einfluss

¹ See A. J. P. V 126.

der englischen Philosophie seit Bacon auf die deutsche Philosophie des 18 Jahrhunderts.

The department of Lehr- und Uebungsbücher für die englische Sprache occupies pp. 114-148. The Miscellanea contain a paper by James Platt on Old English Declension, in the form of additions and emendations to Sievers' Angelsächsische Grammatik.

II.—An important paper is the initial one of this part, entitled The Figurative Mode of Expression in Beowulf and the Edda. The author, A. Hoffmann, presents the opposing views of Heinzel, Ueber den Stil der altgermanischen Poesie (Strassburg, 1875), and of Gummere, The Anglo-Saxon Metaphor, Halle, 1881, and points out the inconsistencies into which the latter is betrayed. No theory of the O. E. metaphor which ignores Norse figures of speech can possibly be tenable. The style of the Edda is then compared with that of Beowulf, and we are led to perceive that in the former it is the imagination which is dominant, while in the latter it is sentiment. Now, the imagination loves the concrete, while sentiment is eminently vague and unplastic, forgetting the external world and immersed in itself. Hoffmann virtually agrees with Heinzel, then, in attributing the O. E. loss of the Germanic simile to the elegiac feeling, the reflectiveness and melancholy which were innate in the Englishman, and were to be still further intensified by Christianity. A compensation for this loss is nevertheless discoverable in the creation of a vigorous rhetorical style, full of a movement and opulence of its own, which rendered the employment of imagery in a measure superfluous. Not to be overlooked are the classified lists of rhetorical figures from the two poems, which are appended to the article proper.

G. Wendt closes his Treatment of English Prepositions in the Realschule of the first class with this, the seventh instalment.

The departments of Book Notices, Lehr- und Uebungsbücher, and Programmschau, are represented as usual. The Miscellanea present some important notes by James Platt, entitled Additions to Sievers' O. E. Grammar. The number ends with a Zeitschriftenschau.

III.—K. Elze contributes Last Notes on 'Mucedorus,' occupying pp. 311-321.

Friedrich Kluge discusses the O. E. poem of the *Seafarer* in the first of a series of papers headed On Old English Poems. He assents to Rieger's theory (Zacher's Zeitschrift, I 334-339) of a dialogue between father and son in vv. 1-64. But Rieger seeks to compress the whole poem, including the homiletic portion at the end, into the mould of this dialogue, and it is here that Kluge's opposition begins. Emphasizing the poetic insight and the comprehension of psychical situations and processes displayed in the first half of the poem, he undertakes to demonstrate the inferiority of the second, and to prove that it must be by another hand. Though Kluge sometimes betrays the animus of a special pleader, his article must be taken into account by every scholar who would discuss the poem in question.

Hermeneutical and Phraseological Notes on Tom Brown's Schooldays is the title of a paper by Otto Kares.

Notes on the Language of Carlyle, by M. Krummacher. This paper is indispensable to any one who desires to investigate Carlyle's linguistic peculiarities, and forms an admirable supplement to Minto's treatment in the latter's Manual of English Prose Literature.

Notes on Macaulay's History, V, by R. Thum.

K. Elze contributes three pages of notes on 'The Tempest.'

F. H. Stratmann, under the heading Etymological, discusses Mod. Engl. *chaff, gasp, blotch, scorch, and shoot.*

Kölbding publishes Collations, the works emended being The Proces of the Sevyn Sages, in Weber's Metrical Romances, III 8 ff., The Seven Sages, edited by Wright, Ein angelsächsisches leben des Neot, edited by Wülcker in Anglia III 104-114, and Wülcker's Altenglisches Lesebuch, Zweiter Theil.

W. Sattler, Zur englischen Grammatik, VI.

York Powell, A Few Notes on Sir Tristram.

The Book Notices and Miscellanea are much briefer than usual, pp. 465-479.

ALBERT S. COOK.

MNEMOSYNE, Vol. XII, Part 4.

In pp. 337-372 of this part Naber continues his "Homerica Posteriora." Before beginning to reduce to order his notes, made long ago, he tells us that he read the Iliad over again to see if he could discover any additional grounds for adhering to or for rejecting his suspicions. Even this last reading "non fuit sine fructu; veluti statim haesi ad A 46, quem locum millies sine offensione legeram." In the lines ἐκλαγάν δ' ἀρ' ὄιστοι ἐπ' ὕμων Χωρένου | αὐτοῦ κινηθέντος· ὁ δ' ἡγε τυκτὶ ἑουκώς, "primum hic offendit iteratum participium Χωρένου· jam enim dixerat poeta iratum deum esse, ac praeterea inutiliter irae mentio fit: haec enim non causa fuit cur sagittae clangorem ederent, sed ipsa celeritas, qua deus de Olympo desiluit. Neque iratus Apollo est Aen. IV 149 vel IX 660, cum *tela sonant humeris* vel Camilla Aen. XI 652. Etiam constructio laborat, quod interpres frustra negant; audi modo: *αὐτοῦ κινηθέντος nicht mehr wie Χωρένου, von ὕμων abhängig, sondern in freierer Verbindung angefügt: so wie er sich selbst in Bewegung gesetzt.* Scilicet talia probantur, donec melius inventum fuerit." Zenodotus, indeed, whose authority "hodie pluris habetur, quam quo tempore omnes jurabant in Lehrsii verba," ηθέτησε these two lines, partly no doubt offended by *τυκτὶ ἑουκώς*, for which he gave *τυκτὶ ἐλνοθείς*. Though the imitation in λ 606 shows that *ἑουκώς* is the true reading "contendo facilius esse admirari quam intelligere, quo illa Apollinis cum nocte comparatio pertineat . . . propemodum ridiculum est describere Apollinis imaginem, qui quantus erat totus noctis similis erat, neque a quoquam conspici poterat." A comparison of Δ 420, Ν 19, Χ 32 suggests that for Χωρένου we should read *ρωμένου* "quo facto sequens versiculos sponte excidet . . . Talia cum videam, confirmatur mihi id quod saepe suspicatus sum, multa utilia etiam hodie inesse in Zenodoti lectionibus, quas si quis sine praedjudicata opinione examinabit, etiam si verae non videantur esse, tamen viam monstrabunt, qua pergere querendo debemus." Then follow comments on about 110 passages in the Iliad, in many of which the reader is referred to "Quaestiones Homericae" for their justification: as on A 60, εἰ κεν θάνατόν γε φύγοιμεν:

"Lege: φύγωμεν. Cf. Qu. Hom. p. 97." The same reference is given to support the reading δὲ εἰπῃ for δὲ κ' εἰποι in A 66. On A 173, ἐνθάδ' ἀτιμος ἐὸν ἀφένος καὶ πλοῦτον ἀφίξειν he says: "hic breviter Nauckius: ἀφίξειν suspectum. Concedo. Quid reponendum? Confer modo M 214 . . . unde ibidem requiro: ἀφένος καὶ πλοῦτον ἀλέξειν, quod primum proclivi errore factum est ἀφέξειν, deinde ἀφίξειν." A 555: νῦν δὲ αἰνῶς δεῖδοικα κατὰ φρένα μῆ σε παρείπῃ | ἀργυρόπτεῖα θέτις, "non opus est dicere cur Bentleius hic παρέλθη scribere voluerit, sed Herwerdenus, postquam lectissime observavit indicativum modum requiri, 'digamma' inquit 'tam saepe neglectum violentis remediis reducere plenum est opus aleae'; itaque satis habuit commendare παρείπεν. De indicativo modo concedo omnia itemque concedo Aeolicam literam non violentis remediis reducendam esse. Quid autem si lene remedium sufficit? Scribam: νῦν Σ' αἰνῶς δεῖδοικα κατὰ φρένα μῆ παρείπεν. Etiam Homerus sic loqui solet, veluti E 85: Τυδείδην δὲ οὐκ ἀν γνοίς ποτέροισι μετεῖη. I 191: δέγμενος Αἴακιδην, δπότε λήξειν ἀείδων. Vide praeterea Σ 261 et Υ 311." On E 46, where Idomeneus is said to wound Phaestos ἵππων ἐπιβησάμενον κατὰ δεξιὸν ὄμον· ἡριπε δὲ ἐξ ὅχεων, he agrees with Herwerden that the partic. cannot have a future sense, "quum curru non possit excidere, qui eum nondum concenderit"; but thinks him wrong in regarding it as an aor., "nec tamen amicus meus videtur animadvertisse horum aoristorum participia non fuisse in usu"; to confirm which he gives a full account of the words of that formation actually found. Referring to E 20 and Υ 401, where warriors abandon their chariots to escape danger, he conjectures that we should read ἀποβησάμενον, thinking that "locum de industria corruptum fuisse ut Zoili reprehensio eluderetur," who, in his comment on E 20, says: λίαν γελοιώς πεποίηκεν δὲ ποιητῆς τὸν Ἰδαιον ἀπολιπόντα τοὺς ἵππους καὶ τὸ ἄρμα φεύγειν· ἡδίνατο γὰρ μᾶλλον ἐπὶ τοῖς ἵπποις. These notes are well worth reading, though they by no means always secure assent to the opinion expressed.

The next article, pp. 373-377, is by J. J. Cornelissen on the second volume of Halm's fourth edition of Tacitus. In Hist. i 2, *Opus aggredior opimum casibus*, taking a hint from Ernesti, he proposes to read *Tempus aggredior horridum casibus*, referring for the use of this verb with *Tempus* in this sense to Plin. Ep. v. 8, 12. In Hist. i 72, where the end of Tigellinus is described, he would substitute *saevo* for *sero* in the sentence *sectis novacula faucibus infamem vitam foedavit etiam exitu sero et in honesto*; and in iii 24 he would write *ignominiam consummatis* for *consumpsitis*. There are other changes suggested which are equally probable with these.

In pp. 378-392 Cobet concludes his notes on Stein's Herodotus, this article covering the ninth book. In c. 1 he finds another instance of the employment of *καταλαμβάνειν* in the sense he gave it in ii 162, οὐκ ἔαν ιέναι ἐκαστέρω, the recognition of which enables him to get rid of certain "verba moleste interposita." ix 4: εἶπε γνώμην ὡς ἔδοκε ἀμεινον εἶναι δεξαμένους τὸν λόγον, τὸν σφι Μουρνχίδης προφέρει, ἔξενεικαί ἐσ τὸν δῆμον. "Qui sententiam dicit utitur verbis ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, ἀλλά μοι δοκεῖ, nunquam sine pronomine. Itaque vera lectio est ὡς ΟΙ ἔδοκε. Praeterea corrigendum ΠΡΟΣφέρει. Respondent enim sibi inter se λόγον προσφέρειν et τὸν λόγον δέχεσθαι vel ἐνδέχεσθαι. Cf. i 60: ἐκδεξαμένου δὲ τὸν λόγον . . . Πειστράτου. iii 134: ἢ Ἀτοσσα προσφέρε . . . τῷ Δαρείῳ λόγον τοιύδε. viii 52: οὐδὲ λόγους τῶν Πειστρατιδέων προσφερόντων περὶ

όμολογης ἐνεδέκοντο. viii 100 . . . et aliis locis." The notes are throughout of this character, and do not offer much that is of special interest. On ix 53, λοχηγέων τοῦ Πιτανῆτεων λόχου, where he says "certa est Koenii emendatio Πιτανῆτεω ut paullo inferius ἀπολιπεῖν τὸν λόγον τὸν Πιτανῆτην," he again charges Thucydides with having misunderstood Herodotus. In this case "fuerat in illo bello cohors, quae cum tota ἐκ Πιτανῆτεων constaret, optime ὁ Πιτανῆτης λόχος appellabatur, neque inde sequitur in Spartanorum exercitu semper cohortem eo nomine fuisse." As to the assumed double vote of the Spartan kings, his opinion is here more clearly expressed than it was on vi 57. "hoc Herodotus dixit : si DUO reges in curia non adessent, ex Senatorum numero UNUM proxime iis cognatum pro duobus regibus absentibus DUO suffragia ferre suumque TERTIUM. Itaque reges singuli sive praesentes sive absentes singula suffragia in curia ferent. Poterat Herodotus scribere : ΤΟΝ μάλιστά σφι τῶν γερόντων προσήκοντΑ et sic nihil fuisset ambiguī, sed quis non de duobus certis regibus sed de omnibus cogitabat, maluit dicere τοὺς μάλιστά σφι τῶν γερόντων προσήκοντας, quae res Thucydiadem in errorem induxit."

C. M. Francken continues, pp. 393-404, his notes *ad Ciceronis Palimpsestos*. He says: "ad singulos locos non tantum notabo ea quae librariorum mendis corrupta sunt, sed etiam si usu veniat, quae ipsius auctoris errore minus recte se habere videntur, velut statim : I. 'non duo Scipiones oriens incendium belli Punici secundi sanguine suo restinxissent.' Parum recte haec dicta sunt, quasi duo Scipiones in Hispania initio belli Punici secundi cecidissent ante pugnam Cannensem et Fabii dictaturam : P. et Cn. Cornelii Scipiones duobus fere annis post pugnam Cannensem in Hispania nobili morte inclaruerunt, cum P. initio belli ad Ticinum et Trebiam victus esset, neque alter inclaruisset." On a passage in which C. F. W. Müller reads *sint* in a relative clause, where *sunt* is given by the editors generally, there is a long and useful note. "Est sane externa quaedam inaequalitas multis locis, non tamen ea, ut mutatae constructionis ratio lateat; quae si nulla sit, deserendos codices puto." After citing many examples where the difference of the indicative and subjunctive is slight but perceptible, he concludes: "res tum potissimum difficilis est, si certam normam desideres; neque enim ad numeros revocari potest; sentimus tamen usu docti uter modus sit aptior, etsi rationes dare subinde difficile est, sentimus varias quasi modulationes elocutionis, maiorem minorem fiduciam loquentis; discrimen inter relativa definitiva et qualitativa animadvertisimus singulis paene locis; aliis, ubi uterque modus sententia non alienus est, codices omne momentum habent, a quibus propter legem aliquam subtiliter a grammaticis excogitata non temere recedendum est. In eo assentior Mullero."

In the next article, pp. 405-432, we have more *Herodotea* from Herwerden. He tells us that after having in 1883 published a critical commentary on books I, II, he determined to prepare an edition of the whole work, the first part of which will soon appear. In this paper he gives notes on books III and IV. There is not much in them which can be regarded as interesting apart from the context, and, as might be anticipated, a very large portion of them is devoted to the detection of the 'insulsa additamenta' of the copyists. Two or three extracts only can be made. iii 15: ἐνθα τοῦ λοιποῦ διαιτᾶτο ἔχων οὐδὲν βίᾳον. "Non haererem, si legeretur ἔχων οὐδὲν κακόν aut aliquid simile, sed ἔχων οὐδὲν βίᾳον non magis Graecum videtur quam Latinum est nihil habere

violentii. Corrigendum suspicor (πά)ΣΧΩΝ." [But subsequently, in commenting on vi 9, οὐδὲ βιαιότερον ἔξοντι οὐδὲν ἡ πρότερον εἶχον, he says that in this passage "iniuria pro ἔχων tentavi πάσχων."] iii 41, πεντηκόντερον πληρώσας [ἀνδρῶν] ἐστβη ἐς αὐτήν. "Abiciatur manifestum emblema. Non sane asinos aut boves navi imposuit Polycrates." iii 52, οἰκτειρε. "Etiam sine titulorum ope sciri potuerat verum verbi formam esse οἰκτίρειν. Nam sic tantum inde formari potuerunt nomina οἰκτίρμος et οἰκτίρμων, et huic soli formae respondet forma Aeolica οἰκτίρμειν, siquidem formae οἰκτειρειν respondere debebat οἰκτέρησειν." iii 69, εὐ εἰδέναι ως ἀστόνει μιν. "Pronomen noli cum Steinio interpretari ἐντήν, sed αὐτήν, nam Attice quoque hoc in simili compositione potius usurparetur quam illud. Contra semet ipsum interfecit Ionice non magis sonaret ἀπέκτενε μιν quam Attice ἀπέκτενεν αὐτήν, sed in utraque dialecto necessarium foret pronomen reflexinum." iii 104: θερμότατος δέ ἐστι ὁ ἥλιος τούτου τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὸ ἑωθινόν [H. omits the last two words in his quotation], οὐ κατάπερ τοῖς ἄλλοισι μεσαμβρίῃς, ἄλλ' ἵπερτειλας μέχρι οὐ ἀγορῆς διαλίσσοις. τούτον δὲ τὸν χρόνον καὶ τοῦ πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἡ τῷ μεσαμβρίᾳ [τὴν Ἑλλάδα], οὐτως ὅστε ἐν (abesse malim ἐν) ὑδατι λόγος αὐτούς ἐστι βρέχεσθαι τηνικαῦτα. "Nihil horum intellexit quisquis interpolavit τὴν Ἑλλάδα. Nam procul dubio dixit scriptor, apud Indos tempus antemeridianum caldius esse quam post meridianum." This seems a very questionable criticism.

Cobet writes, pp. 433-442, *de locis nonnullis apud Aelianum ΠΕΡΙ ΖΩΙΩΝ.* i. 30: ὁ λάζραξ . . . εἰη ἀν, εἰ καὶ Πταίσας ἔρω, ἵχθιν ὄφοφαγίστατος. "Bona fide Interpres: 'cum labendi periculo dicam.' Verum vidit Jacobs restituens Πταίσας, sed indigne spretum est. In hoc quidem verbo semper Aelianus ἀττικίζει scribens παίσω, ἐπαίσα, πέπαισται, συμπαίστης, non παῖξω, ἐπαῖξα cet. ut aequales solebant." ii 15: δίκην εἰρίνΟΥ κυνός. "Graecum est κίνων εἵρις, κυνὸς εἴρινΟΣ, sed Graeculos ratio fugit qui εἴρινος nominativum esse inepte opinabantur . . . Fefellit homunciones versiculus Sophoclis in Aiace 7: κυνὸς Δακαίνης ὡς τις εἴρινος βάσις." iii 2: καράτου δὲ ἡ τι αἰσθονται η οὐδέν. "Barbarum est αἰσθονται pro αἰσθάνονται. Sero nati Graeculi opinabantur duo esse verba diversae significationis αἰσθεοθαι ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀκριβώς εἰδέναι τι et αἰσθάνεοθαι ἐπὶ τοῦ ὑπονοεῖν. Cf. Bekk. *Anecdota*, p. 359, 6. Nihil esse in his veri quis hodie nescit?" xi 32: νύκτωρ ἦν πυράφορος καὶ ἐκ τοῦ λέχοντος ἀνεθόρνυτο. "Id est ἐκ τῆς κλίνης ἀνήλικον et qui sic loquitur putat se ἀττικιστὶ loqui. Quid est θόρνυσθαι, ἀναθόρνυσθαι, ἐπιθόρνυσθαι Aelianus non intellexit, qui putabat idem esse quod θρώσκειν, ἀναθρώσκειν, ἐπιθρώσκειν. Θόρνυσθαι est σπερμαίνειν, unde θόρος et θορή est σπέρμα, et cum notione saliendi, exsiliendi nihil commune habet." "Dixit alicubi Aelianus (xiii 15): οὐκ εἴμι ποιητὴς ὄνομάτων, quod gaudemus, nam si quando novum vocabulum fingit ridicule se dare solet. *Vīnos* ab omnibus Graecis dicitur φίλονος, ab Aeliano solo οἰνεραστής."

In pp. 443-448 Cobet concludes this part with some remarks *ad Galenum*. There are only about three suggestions of change in the text; but interesting extracts are made touching Galen's own study and his relation to the fashionable physicians of the day. One of these may be here quoted: "Pessime Galenus oderat Thessalam Neroni aequalem medicum (Tom. x, p. 7) et Thessali discipulos, ὃνος Θεσσαλείους et τὴν τῶν Θεσσαλείων ὃνων ἀγέλην. Itaque Galenus καίτοι οὐκ εἰθισμένος ἔξελέγχειν πικρῶς τοὺς σκαιούς, ut ipsi ait Tom. x, p. 8,

asperrimis verbis passim insectatur hominem artis imperitum, impudentissimum, foedum Romanorum adulatorem. Tom. x, p. 5: ὁ Θεσσαλὸς οὐ τὰ ἄλλα μόνον ἐκολάκευε τοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς Ρώμης πλουσίους, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ μησὶν ἐξ ἐπαγγεῖλασθαι διδάξειν τὴν τέχνην, ἑτοίμως ἐλάμβανε μαθητὰς παμπόλλους. Praeclarus hic artis magister ex alta cathedra iactabat, nullum esse medicis usum οὔτε γεωμετρίας οὔτε ἀστρονομίας οὔτε διαλεκτικῆς οὔτε μουσικῆς οὔτε ἀλλον τινὸς μαθήματος τῶν καλῶν . . . διὰ τοῦτο καὶ σκυτοτόμοι καὶ τέκτονες καὶ βαφεῖς καὶ χαλκεῖς ἐπιπηδῶσιν ἥδη τοὺς ἔργους τῆς ιατρικῆς τὰς ἀρχαίας αὐτῶν ἀπολιπόντες τέχνας."

XIII, Part I.

The first fourteen pages of this part are filled by Cobet with notes *ad Galenum*. He finds some corrections to make, which are always happy, and cites many "memorabiles locos," which, notwithstanding their length, he says "non gravabor describere iis, quibus Galeni inspiciendi non est copia." "Notanda sunt quae Galenus, Tom. xi, p. 690, scribit de mari mortuo: τὸ τῆς ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ Συρίᾳ λίμνης ὑδωρ, ἦν ὄνομάζοντιν οἱ μὲν θάλασσαν νεκράν, οἱ δὲ λίμνην ἀσφαλτίτιν, ἐστι μὲν γενομένης οὐχ ἀλυκὴ μόνον ἄλλὰ καὶ πικρόν, et p. 691: οὐδὲ εἰ βούλοι κατὰ τοῦ βάθους ἔαντὸν φέρεσθαι κάτω δυνηθείς ἀν. οὐτως ἔξαιρει τε καὶ κονφίζει τὸ ὑδωρ· et p. 693: φαίνεται ἐν ἑκείνῳ τῷ ὑδατι μήτε ζῶσ έγγιγνόμενον μήτε φυτόν, ἄλλὰ καὶ τῶν εἰς αὐτὴν ἐμβαλλόντων ποταμῶν ἀμφοτέρων μεγίστους καὶ πλείστους ἔχοντων ιχθύας καὶ μάλιστα τοῦ πλησίου Ιεριχοῦντος, διν Ιαρδάνης ὄνομάζοντον, οὐδεὶς τῶν ιχθύων ὑπερβαίνει τὰ στόματα τῶν ποταμῶν· καὶ εἰ συλλαβάν τις αὐτοὺς ἐμβάλοι τῇ λίμνῃ διαφεύρομένους ὑφεται ταχέως. Tom. xii, p. 254: αἱ σάρκες τῶν ὕδων ἐοίκασι ταῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων. ίσμεν γοῦν ἥδη πολλοὺς ἀλόντας πανδοκέας τε καὶ μαγείρους ἐν τῷ πιτράσκειν ὡς ὕεια τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων κρέα, καίτοι τῶν ἐσθίοντων αὐτὰ διαφορᾶς οὐδεὶς ησθάνετο. ἄλλὰ καὶ διηγομένων τινῶν ἥκουσα πιστῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐδηδοκέναι μὲν ἐν τινι πανδοκείφ ζωμὸν δαψιλῆ μετὰ κρεῶν ἥδιστων, ἥδη δὲ ἐμπεπλησμένων εὑρεῖν ἐν αὐτῷ δακτύλουν μέρος τὸ πρόσω πατ' αὐτὸν τὸν δυνχα, φοιηθέντες δὲ τοὺς ἐν τῷ πανδοκείφ μὴ καὶ αὐτοὺς φάγωσιν ὡς εἰθισμένοι τοῦ πράγματος αὐτίκα μὲν ἔξελθειν, ἐμέσαντες δὲ τὰ ἐδηδεσμένα τῆς ὁδοιπορίας ἔχεσθαι, καὶ μέντοι καὶ φωραθῆναι τοὺς κατὰ τὸ πανδοκείφ οὐ μετὰ πολὺν χρόνον ἔφασαν ἐφ' οἷς ἔσφαττον ἀνθρώπους. Tom. xiii, p. 267: ἡ τοῦ Φίλωνος (ἀντίδοτος) ἐνδοξος ἐγένετο· περὶ ἣς αὐτὸς ἐποίησε τάδε τὰ ἔλεγεια· Ταρσέος ἵητροιο μέγα θητοῖσι Φίλωνος | εἴνειμα πρὸς πολλάς εἴμι παθῶν δύνας. Sero nati hi poeta ita utuntur vetere lingua epica, ut vitia et errores aequalium admisceant. Ex nota analogia veteres dicebant εὐρῆμα, εὐρεοις, ut βῆμα, βάσις; στῆμα (σύστημα, διάστημα) στάσις; θῆμα (ἀνάθημα) θέσις; φῦμα, φύσις· κρῆμα, κρίσις· κλῖμα, κλίσις· πῶμα, πόδις· et alia plura. In his omnibus Graecolorum συνήθεια longam vocalem in brevem convertit . . . et poetastri promiscue utuntur formis antiquis et novis . . . Philo melior medicus quam poeta utitur de industria oratione obscura et caliginosa σκοτεινῇ καὶ αἰνιγματώδει . . . omitto plura eiusdem modi, sed mirificum est quod de opio canit: scribe ΠΙΟΝ et praefige articulum masculini generis 'Ο, et sic fiet δπιον et δπιον. 'Επει, inquit, τὸ δνομα ἐκ τῆς Ο φωνῆς καὶ τῆς ΠΙΟΝ σύγκειται διὰ τοῦτο ἐφη· ΠΙΟΝ δὲ γράφας ἀρθρον βάλε πρῶτον ἐπ' αὐτῷ | ἀρρεν. Haud vidi magis."

Next, pp. 15-42, Herwerden continues his *Herodotea*, v 49, 4: ἔχοντες κυρβασίας ἐπὶ τῆσι κεφαλῆσι. "Herodotus et Attici de coronis, pileis, galeis, et quovis capitilis tegmine usurpant praepositionem περί, quam hi cum accusativo, ille

cum dativo iungere assolet. Praepositionem apud utrosque propter sequiorum usum ἐπί adhibentium saepissime obliteratam fideliter libri et alibi frequen-tissime servarunt et vii 61 init. περὶ μὲν τῆσι κεφαλῆσι εἰχον τίθρας." v. 79; ἀλὴν πουησάμενοι. "Cf. i 125, ἀλὶην ἐποιήσατο, Attici contra in ea re usurpant verbum activum, ποιεῖν ἑκκλησίαν, σύλλογον cett." v. 106, ἄλλ' εἶπερ τι τοιοῦτο οἷον σὺ εἰρηκας πρήσσει ὁ ἔμος ἐπίτροπος, ισθι αὐτὸν ἐπ' ἐωτοῦ βαλλόμενον πεποιηκέναι. "Requiro ἐπρῆξε vel πέπρηχε aut mox ποιεῖν et βαλλόμενον, ut est iii 155, ἐπ' ἐμεωτοῦ βαλλόμενος ἐπρῆξα, et iii 71. Eadem correctione indiget locus iv 160. Ita iam scripseram, cum subito me advertit soloecismus: ισθι αὐτὸν . . . πεποιηκέναι pro legitimo participio. Inspectis autem codicum scripturis video partem eorum pro Πεποιηκέναι exhibere πεπρηχέναι, quales discrepantiae repe-riri solent in magistellorum supplementis. Scilicet neutra lectio genuina est, eaque deleta tam πρήσσει quam βαλλόμενον bene habet. Dederat Herodotus: ἄλλ' εἶπερ τι τοιοῦτο . . . πρήσσει . . . Ισθι αὐτὸν ἐπ' ἐωτοῦ βαλλόμενον, scito enim proprio uti consilio." On vi 31 he protests against Cobet's readiness to change present participles into aorists when the action is antecedent to that of the verb: for "saepissime tam apud Atticos quam apud Herodotum participium præsens reperitur, ubi sermo est de re saepius repetita et præsertim ubi mores et consuetudines describuntur, quibus locis paene omnibus Cobetus restitu iubet aoristos. Si tantum modo ageretur de levibus quibusdam discrepantiis, in quibus nulla omnino est codicum auctoritas, velut in scribendo γενόμενοι pro γενόμενοι . . . aliisque eiusmodi, viro summo obloqui non auderem; sed non ita rem comparatam esse docebunt exempla nonnulla, a quorum correctione prudens manum abstinuit, ex ipso Herodoto mihi collecta, quaeque facili negotio augeri possunt"; and he then quotes i 203; ii 41 bis; 136; iii 38 bis; 128; 143; iv 23, and would on the same ground prefer to retain ἀπογνόμενον in v 4. On vi 33 he writes: "quod attinet ad Προκόννησος, constat omnia nomina propria composita cum νῆσος semper liquidam duplicasce, excepta eo quod est Χερσόνησος, quod eadem constantia una liquida exarari solet." In vi 110 we are told that each of the σπαραγγοί before Marathon offered his command to Miltiades; ὃ δὲ δεκόμενος οὐτι κα συμβολὴν ἐπικέπετο, πρὶν γε δὴ αὐτοῦ πρωτανὴν ἐγένετο. "Vertunt, haud dubie recte, 'at ille, quamvis acciperet, non tamen prius commisit proelium quam legitimus ipsius dies adisset.' Subit mirari quid Miltiadem impulerit, ut oblatam sibi identidem ab aliis praetoribus summam imperii acciperet, si tamen ea non uti statuisset; itaque non dubito quin dictus sit ab Herodoto illam non accepisse, et hic quoque ut saepe perierit negatio. Corrigatur igitur: ὃ δὲ (οὐ) δεκόμενος κτέ. Bene attendendum ad imperfecti usum παρεδίδοσαν, tradere volebant, offerebant." In his note on v 57, where he adopts Madvig's conjecture of οὐ πολλῶν for πολλῶν, he says: "incredibile dictu est quoties librarii negationem neglexerint," and gives references.

The next article, pp. 43-54, contains more notes by C. M. Francken, *ad Ciceronis Palimpsestos*. Francken has not the command of easy Latin which the writers in this journal generally possess, and his communications are somewhat hard reading. Most of the notes are too long for citation here; but one specimen may be given. "Archytas iratus propterea, quod iratus esset, servum delinquentem non occidit, ita illum compellans: 'o te infelicem, quem necassem iam verberibus, nisi iratus essem.' Legendum 'o te felicem,' felix erat eo quod Archytas iratus esset et nihil ab irato faciendum esse putaret.

'Ergo Archytas iracundiam videlicet dissidentem a ratione seditionem quan-dam **ABANIMORE DUCEBAT**.' Sic manus prior; altera deleto *ab* suprascriptis MI supra NIM, VE supra OR, quod interpretatur Halmius recte: *animi movere ducebatur*, a quo non erat descindendum; Baiterus cum Weissenbornio: 'ab animo removendam censebat,' Reisig 'animi vere ducebatur' quod ipse olim probavi, sed dies diem docet: *verum enim a sententia alienum, quamvis probatum ab Hauptio et C. Muellero; si iudicio Laelii indigeret dictum Archytae, posset plane omitti, non Laelius Archytae sed contra Archytas Laelio auctoritatem conciliat.* Legatur igitur: 'iracundiam, videlicet dissidentem a ratione, seditionem quandam *animo movere ducebatur*.'

We have more 'Observationes Criticae in Herodotum,' pp. 55-81, from Naber. He traverses the whole nine books, and it is hard to make a typical selection for this notice. Naber's confidence in his own improvements leaves nothing to be desired. 'Ecquis contradicet?' he says, in so many words or in effect, nearly always. On i 98 Stein maintains that while we must write *ησσων*, the Ionic verb is *ἔσσονται*. "Fieri potest ut contra omnium codicum consensum nihil mutandum sit, quamquam mirum sit *ησσων* iis potuisse placere, qui tamen pronunciarent *ἔσσονται*, sed tamen confiteor multa esse ejusmodi quorum rationem haud ita facile perspicere possis . . . scribimus tamen *κρέσσων* et *μέζων* quia sic voluerem librarii. Quid autem *θάσσον*, *ἄσσον*, et *μᾶλλον*? Nonne Ionice scribendum est *θάσσον*, *ἄσσον* et *μᾶλλον*, si quidem Ionica sunt *κρέσσον* et *μέζον*? In ea certe re nihil attinet codices interrogare." "Apud Babylonios aegroti efferuntur in forum I 197; deinde medicum agit quicumque *αὐτὸς τοιοῦτον ἔπαθε δύοιον ἔχει οἱ κάμενων η ἀλλον εἰδε παθόντα· ταῦτα προσιύντες συμβούλευνονται καὶ παρανέουνται, ἄσσα αὐτὸς ποιήσας ἐξέφυγε δροίην νοῦσον η ἀλλον εἰδε ἐκφυγόντα.* Ipsa rei ratio suadet, ut bis *οἴδε* rescribamus. Argumento sunt quoque aoristi *παθόντα* et *ἐκφυγόντα*, nec quidquam cuiquam prodest ut medicus fiat vidisse *τοὺς τι παθόντας*." In iv 75 we are told of the use the Scythians make of the vapor arising from the burning seeds of the cannabis. *τοῦτο σφι ἀντὶ λοντροῦ ἔστι· οὐ γάρ δὴ λοίονται ὑδατι τὸ παράπαν τὸ σῶμα . . .* "Haec, inquam, intelligi possunt; sed quid est illud quod interponitur: *οἱ δὲ Σκύθαι ἀγάμενοι τῇ πυρὶ ὥριονται.* Inaudita est constructio verbi *ἀγασθαι* eaque etiam Valckenaerio offensioni fuit. Deinde quid est *ὥριονται*? Talem vim in can-nabi inesse narrant . . . Perscribit Valckenaerius multas aliorum conjecturas, *ἀρίονται, πυριῶνται, ὥριγνῶνται*, ipsi *ὅπτονται* placet. Nihil horum Steinio dignum fuit visum quod commemoraretur et putare videtur *ὥριονται* sic satis bene explicari posse. Haud male ad loci sententiam Valckenaerius *ὅπτονται* scripsit, etiamsi ab principio *ἀγάμενοι*, sapienter fortasse, manus abstinuerit. Fieri potest ut tam illustre exemplum sequi deberem, idque sequerer, nisi satis lenis mutatio sese mihi obtulisset. Quid si Herodotus scripsit: *οἱ δὲ Σκύθαι διανθέμενοι τῇ πυρὶ χρίονται καὶ τοῦτο σφι ἀντὶ λοντροῦ ἔστι.*" In v 92 the ghost of Melissa, wife of Periander, complains that she is freezing: *τῶν γάρ οἱ συγκατέθαψε εἰμάτων δρελος εἶναι οὐδὲν οὐ κατακαυθέντων.* "Inaudita querela est, quam tum demum intelligere possemus, si Melissa omni veste detracta in rogam imposita fuisse. Sed ricinia cum cadavere comburuntur; jam nullus eorum usus est; itaque Melissa questa est εἰμάτων δρελος εἶναι οὐδὲν συγκατακαυθέντων." But Herodotus goes on to say that Periander, on a festival, stripped the Corinthian matrons of their best array, *κόσμῳ τῷ καλλιστῷ* and *σύμφορήσας ἐς δρυγμα*

Μελίσση ἐπενχύμενος κατέκαιε. "Itaque his vestibus misera Melissa non magis uti potuit: nuda mansit ut erat, nec video quomodo ejus ira placata sit. Deinde vestes in fossam, δρυγμα, collatae ne cremari quidem possunt, dum fumus omnia obtinet et aer intercluditur." The solution is that by *κόσμος* is meant the gold ornaments of the ladies, and that these "non κατέκαιε sed συμφορήσας ἐς δρυγμα κατεκλήσε. Hoc magis decebat hominem avarum, qui tunc hoc agebat ut παρακαταθῆκεν ξενικὴν interciperet." This appears a truly amazing exegesis. After this article of Naber's, Herwerden says: "Satisfacere debeo Nabero meo de iniuriis, quas certa quadam de causa nimium festinans primi Herodoti mei voluminis editionem ei intuli." The wrong consists in his having not availed himself as he ought of Naber's notes, published in *Mnemosyne* for 1853-4. The cause of this 'paene incredibilis socordia' is that at that time he had entered some of those emendations in the margin of his copy, and fancied that he had entered them all. Hence it has come to pass that he has attributed to himself or to Cobet corrections originally proposed by Naber. He gives a list of these; and mentions others through books I and II which he wishes he had known. He promises more care for the future.

The last pages of this part are occupied with critical notes, first on Lucian, and then on the Roman History of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, by K. G. P. Schwartz. Many of the suggestions made have much probability; but none of them states any principle of general interest, or which seems important enough to deserve quotation.

On the parts of pages otherwise unoccupied, H. W. van der Mey contributes a few notes on Diodorus Siculus.

C. D. MORRIS.

BRIEF MENTION.

CAMPBELL and ABBOTT's *Sophocles for the Use of Schools*, which appears in two neat volumes (Oxford, At the Clarendon Press, 1886), is not a mere compilation from the larger Sophocles of the first-named distinguished scholar, and every student of Sophocles will consult both. Not only are the renderings very often changed for the better, but 'in the illustrations of grammatical constructions the smaller edition is sometimes more full than the larger,' and the notes often give indication of what is very rare in a mature scholar, fresh insight into the working of grammatical laws, or, at any rate, a certain impressibility denied to most grammarians, who soon become case-hardened. Of course, Professor Campbell has not got rid of his delight in double constructions. That has become part of his mental constitution. So he imagines in the smaller edition, as in the larger, that a genitive of time by some sea-change can become another genitive when another seductive combination presents itself (Ai. 241); but he has revised his position in other respects, not unfrequently for the better. A construction (Ai. 388: ὅτως οὐχ ἀδ' ἔχειν) which was 'simple' in 1881, has become 'remarkable' in 1886. No longer 'may' ἡκη be the true reading (Ai. 279): judgment is rendered in favor of ἡκει. Formerly (Ai. 401) 'the subj.' was 'excused by the implication of the first person in the third.' Now 'the lines are hopelessly corrupt,' and nothing is said about the rule, a very good rule, if it did not require so much stretching as in Dem. 21, 35: ὁ τοιοῦτος μὴ δῷ δίκην; where we have to get up an equivalent τὸν τοιοῦτον μὴ τιμωρησάμεθα. The note on Ai. 472 (*μῆ*) is not to be found in the new ed. The construction is normal, but some reference should have been given. The notes on Ai. 473: τὸν μακροῦ βίον, are different in the two editions, both equally helpless and unsatisfactory. In this ed. the editors say, 'Life is either long or short. The article marks one of the two alternatives.' Without going into the interesting question whether one must always take up this attitude towards life, nothing seems plainer than that the article is used in its deictic, contemptuous sense, so common with the articular infinitive (Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc. 1878, p. 18; Pind. O 2, 106). 'Your' often gives the true sense, as in οὗτος. 'Your long life,' 'long life, usually sought so much.' Exactly so O. R. 518: οὗτοι βίοι μοι τὸν μακραινός πόθος. Exactly so O. C. 1214: αἱ μακραὶ ἀμέραι (see the context). Exactly so Ar. Lys. 256: ἡ πόλλῃ δελπτ' ἐνεστίν ἐν τῷ μακρῷ βίῳ, φεῦ, where the article gives a serio-comic touch. Comp. also P. 4, 186: τὰν ἀκίνδυνον παρὰ ματὶ μένειν αἰῶνα πέσσοντα, and my note. But a detailed comparison of this sort would carry us beyond the limits of 'Brief Mention.' The type of the text, despite its clearness, is unpleasantly small.

GEORGE SAINTSBURY has selected and edited for the Clarendon Press Series, Oxford, parts of some of *Sainte-Beuve's Causeries du Lundi*. The difficulty lay in selecting from the rich stores of this great master of delicate literary

criticism, and the task could not have been intrusted to a more accomplished scholar than Mr. Saintsbury. The notes are few in number and avoid the trivialities of grammar—unnecessary at the stage at which Sainte-Beuve can be enjoyed. As every undergraduate sets up to be a critic, it is no small service to show this enterprising class of intellects what is necessary to the highest attainments in an art which ought to be, not the refuge of failure, but the high-water mark of success.

In the preface Mr. Saintsbury quotes Sainte-Beuve's 'famous saying (better known, perhaps, than any other single phrase of his) that "il existe dans les trois quarts des hommes un poëte qui meurt jeune tandis que l'homme survit.'" He ought to have added that Alfred de Musset did as much as any one to give this saying currency, for the last line of his version is a stock quotation :

Il existe, en un mot, chez les trois quarts des hommes
Un poëte mort jeune à qui l'homme survit.

Mr. Saintsbury's annotations are sometimes flippant, and the reviewer who thinks that notes are not the place for fun, will be apt to frown when he reads "'jeta le froc aux orties,' 'threw his gown to the dogs,' though 'ortie' will not invariably translate 'dog.'" As classical philologists, we naturally regret that Mr. Saintsbury did not make room for Sainte-Beuve's Boissonnade, a passage from which adorns M. Croiset's admirable discourse on Egger in a recent number of the *Revue de l'Enseignement*.

Professor DYER's adaptation of Cron's edition of the *Apology and Crito* of Plato (Boston, Ginn & Co., 1885) shows the fine literary touch of the English school to which Professor Dyer belongs by training as well as by native bent. Especial attention has been paid to the legal side of the *Apology*, as was to be expected from an associate of Professor Goodwin, who is high authority in such matters. The grammatical notes generally keep within the safe range of the text-books, and criticism of the points taken would involve criticism of authoritative manuals, for which there is no space here. One grave mistake is made in the Apol. 26 D, where Professor Dyer, following Goodwin, MT. 65, 3, says that "this vivid use of *oī* for *μή* in inf. clauses is not uncommon where it is indifferent whether the indic. or inf. is used ; thus, here *ωστε οὐκ λαστ* or *ωστε μή εἰδέναι* would be equally regular, and *ωστε οὐκ εἰδέναι* is a mixture of the two." The simple fact is that all these *ωστ'* *oī* with inf. clauses are representatives of *oī* with ind. after a verb of saying or thinking, the examples of really irregular *oī* with *ωστε* and inf. being very few and sufficiently notorious. Madvig gave the correct explanation long ago, Gr. §205 R. 3 : "Even with an infinitive after *ωστε* the negative is *oī*, when *ωστε* follows an acc. with inf. governed by *φημί*, *οἶμαι*," etc., and cites this very Platonic passage. Comp. Thuk. 5, 40, 2 (with Classen's note); 8, 76, 6; Lys. 18, 6; 21, 18; Isai. 11, 22; Isokr. 12, 255; Dem. 18, 283; 19, 308, which last passage Goodwin has cited to show how little difference there is between ind. and inf. No wonder, when the inf. represents the indicative !

As in all the White-Seymour series, the mechanical execution is beautiful, the proof-reading exceptionally good, and the index lacking.

MR. SANDYS' first edition of the *Bacchae* of Euripides (1880) called forth the warmest encomiums from scholars and scholarly men everywhere. It was a work about which the labors of fifteen years had gathered, and no side of this strangely fascinating play had been neglected. While more than usual attention had been paid to the archaeology and mythology of the drama, neither critical nor grammatical requirements had been overlooked, and the fine literary taste of the Cambridge Public Orator made itself felt throughout. Exceptionally valuable in its contents, the edition had the advantage of the most beautiful outfit. Type, paper, presswork, illustrations, made it a charm to the eye, and secured it a place among the few bibliographical daintinesses that the philologist must use as well as admire. In a comparatively short space of time a new edition (Cambridge University Press, 1885) has been demanded, and although the stereotyping of the work has prevented any radical changes and made it impossible to cut short some of the prolixities into which Mr. Sandys has been betrayed by his desire to discuss the views of English scholars, still the new edition is not merely a new impression. We are presented with a number of additional illustrations, and the editor has revised the *apparatus criticus* by reading through the whole of that portion of the play which is contained in the Laurentian MS, and there are little touches—corrections in the body of the book, supplementary notes at the end—which show how faithful Mr. Sandys has been to the masterpiece which he has done so much to make accessible to others.

The Vienna dissertation of EMIL REISCH, *De musicis Graecorum certaminibus* (Vienna, Carl Gerold's Sohn, 1885), occupies with great learning a neglected field of literary and archaeological study. Much use has been made of the many inscriptions that bear on the subject, and the treatment touches many points of general interest. The contents are: Cap. I. De antiquissimis Graecorum certaminibus musicis. Cap. II. De certaminibus musicis, quae Athenis inde a Pisistrati temporibus usque ad Alexandri aetatem celebrabantur. Cap. III. De certaminibus musicis, quae usque ad Alexandri aetatem apud ceteras gentes Graeciae habebantur. Cap. IV. De certaminibus musicis, quae in Graecia ipsa inde ab Alexandri temporibus usque ad Augusti aetatem celebrabantur. The appendix contains a number of Boeotian inscriptions bearing on the *dyōvēç*, Orchomenos, as is fit, leading the van. Vol. VI, p. 114, of this Journal, Wilamowitz-Moellendorff's contemptuous rejection of the Pindar and Korinna story was quoted, and a query put to the statement that Pindar's poetry shows that his society knew nothing of the democratic institution of the *dyōvō*. Reisch (p. 56), inclines, as well he might, to the opinion that musical contests were known to the Boeotians, at any rate, but his respect for the vigorous assertion of Wilamowitz has led him to suspend his judgment as to the truth of the contest or contests between Pindar and Korinna.¹

In No. 22 of the *Deutsche Literaturdenkmale des 18 u. 19 Jahrhunderts* (Heilbronn, Gebr. Henninger, 1885) A. SAUER has edited the *Freundschaftliche Lieder von I. J. PYRA und S. G. LANGE*. This little volume, with its careful

¹ For '[K.'s],' A. J. P. VI, p. 114, l. 6 fr. bottom, read '[P. u. K.'s.]'

introduction, is a valuable document for the development of German poetry in the 18th century. While the poems themselves, written in metres which require rhyme, very often offend our ear, they still contain passages of real poetic value, and give us by their language and contents a link between a very prosaic time and the phenomenal rising of young Klopstock. The controversy connected with the appearance of the poems forms an interesting chapter in the history of German criticism.

The school edition of *Ovid's Tristia, Lib. I.*, by S. G. OWEN (Oxford, Clarendon Press), has a scientific value on account of the collation of L (the Marcianus n. 223 of the Laurentian library). Mr. Owen has also himself collated the Holkham MS (H), used by Ellis for the *Ibis*, and has had a collation made of the Vaticanus n. 1606. As might be supposed, all this textual work is done in the interest of an elaborate critical edition, of which this first book only gives a foretaste. The notes refer to Roby and Kennedy for grammatical points, and are enriched by contributions from Ellis, Nettleship and Roby.

WILHELM VIETOR, favorably known by his phonetic work, has undertaken to edit a Phonetic Library (*Phonetische Bibliothek*), the first number of which is C. F. HELLWAG's *Dissertatio Physiologico-Medica de Formatione Loquela*, 1781, the first book in which the vowel triangle makes its appearance, and also the first in which the vowels are conceived and treated not only in their acoustic relations, but also with reference to articulation. (Heilbronn, Gebr. Henninger, 1886.)

CORRESPONDENCE.

European correspondents are requested to send books intended for the Journal by post. The oppressive tax on knowledge is collected with painful fidelity by the Post Office, so that there is no danger of defrauding the revenue. To send a book by express often costs sender and receiver together nearly as much as the value of the book. The charges on a book recently sent, and valued at 7s. 6d., amounted to \$1.35, though the express dues were paid on the other side.

ON AN INSCRIPTION OF GERASA.

The last words of N. 16, in the collection of Dr. S. Merrill's Palestine inscriptions (see Vol. VI, N. 2 of this Journal, p. 196 foll.), should read, as I now perceive, ἀνῆλθεν τὰ ὑπέ(νεφθεν). This affects the calculation of the era of Gerasa only in so far as it reopens the possibility of reading ει' instead of ε' as the induction-year of N. 17 (see page 199 *ibidem*).

ATHENS, Nov. 30, 1885.

FREDERIC D. ALLEN.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. B. Westermann & Co., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN.

Euripides. *Bacchantes*; ed. on the basis of Wecklein, by I. T. Beckwith. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1885. 3 + 146 pp. 12mo, cl., \$1.10; pap., 80 cts.

Harding (B. F.) *Greek inflection*. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1886. 7 + 44 pp. 12mo, cl., 55 cts.

Moss (C. M.) *A first Greek reader*. Boston, *J. Allyn*, 1885. 152 pp. 16mo, hf. leath., 70 cts.

Murray (Ja. A. H.), ed. *A new English dictionary*. 1t. 2. Ant-Batten. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1885. 4to, cl., \$3.25.

Plato. *Apology of Socrates and Crito*; ed. on the basis of Cron, by L. Dyer. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1885. 4 + 204 pp. 12mo, cl., \$1.25; pap., 95 cts.

Seymour (T. D.) *Introduction to the language and verse of Homer*. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1885. 4 + 104 pp. 12mo, cl., 60 cts.; pap., 45 cts.

BRITISH.

Æschylus. *Prometheus Vinctus*. Ed. by Rev. H. M. Stephenson. (El. Class.) 18mo, 72 pp. *Macmillan*. 1s. 6d.

Ancient Arabian Poetry, chiefly pæ-Islamic. Translations, with an introd. and notes, by C. J. Lyall, M. A. Fcap. 4to. *Williams & Norgate*. 10s. 6d.

Aristotle's *Politics*. Translated into English, with introduction, marginal analysis, essays, notes and indices by B. Jowett. 2 vols. 8vo, 766 pp. *Frowde*. 21s.

Bopp (F.) *Comparative Grammar*. Transl. by E. B. Eastwick. 4th ed. 3 vols. 8vo, 1460 pp. *Williams & Norgate*. 31s. 6d.

Byrne (Jam.) *General Principles of the Structure of Language*. 2 vols. 8vo, 920 pp. London, 1885. m. 42.

Cicero. M. Tulli Ciceronis ad M. Brutum Oratio. A revised text, with introductory essays, and critical and explanatory notes, by John Edwin Sandys. 8vo, 350 pp. *Cambridge Warehouse*. 16s.

— *Natura Deorum Libri Tres*. With introduction and commentary by Joseph B. Mayor; together with a new collection of several of the English MSS, by J. H. Swainson. Vol. III. 8vo, 354 pp. *Cambridge Warehouse*. 10s.

Codrington (R. H.) *The Melanesian Languages*. 8vo, 570 pp. *Frowde*. 18s.

Dawe (Rev. C. S.) *The Beginner's Latin Exercise Book*. 3d ed. Cr. 8vo, 112 pp. *Rivingtons*. 1s. 6d.

Garnett (L.) *Greek Folk Songs from the Turkish Provinces of Greece*. Literal and metrical translations, ed. by J. S. Glennie. 8vo, xvi, 260 pp. London, 1885. m. 7.80.

Knowles (Rev. J. Hinton). A Dictionary of Kashmire Proverbs and Sayings Explained and Illustrated. Post 8vo, 268 pp. Bombay, *Thucker, Trübner*. 8s. Livy. Books 23 and 24. Edit. by G. C. Macaulay. With maps. 12mo, 252 pp. *Macmillan*. 5s.

Lupton (J. H.) An Introduction to Latin Elegiac Verse Composition. 12mo, 194 pp. *Macmillan*. 2s. 6d.

Nicholl (G. F.) A Bengali Grammar, also an Assamese Grammar. 12mo, 120 pp. *W. H. Allen*. 2s.

Ovid. Tristia, Book 1. Text revised, with introd. and notes, by S. G. Owen. 12mo, 190 pp. *Frowde*. 3s. 6d.

Plato's Phaedo. Edited, with introd. and notes, by W. D. Geddes. 2d ed. 8vo, 340 pp. *Macmillan*. 8s. 6d.

Sophocles. Oedipus Tyrannus. Edit. by R. C. Jebb. (Pitt Press Series.) 12mo, 204 pp. *Cambridge Warehouse*. 4s. 6d.

Talmud (The) of Jerusalem. Translated, for the first time into English, by Dr. Moses Schwab. Vol. I. The Treatise of Berakhoth. Fcap. 4to. *Williams & Norgate*. 9s.

Virgil. Georgics. Libri 1, 2. Edit., with English notes, by A. Sidgwick. (Pitt Press Series.) 12mo, 188 pp. *Cambridge Warehouse*. 2s.

Wherry (E. M.) A Comprehensive Commentary on the Qurân. (Trübner's Oriental Series.) Vol. III. 8vo, 410 pp. *Trübner*. 12s. 6d.

Whitney (W. D.) The Roots, Verb Forms and Primary Derivatives of the Sanskrit Language. A supplement to his Sanskrit grammar. 8vo, 246 pp. *Trübner*. 7s. 6d.

Wilkins (George). The Growth of the Homeric Poems: A discussion of their origin and authorships. 8vo, 222 pp. Dublin, *Hodges, Longmans*. 6s.

Xenophon's Anabasis. Book 1. Ed. by J. Marshall. 12mo, 140 pp. *Frowde*. 2s. 6d.

— Books 3 and 4, with the modern Greek version of Professor Michael Constantinides. Edited, with prefatory note, by R. C. Jebb. New ed. 12mo, 148 pp. Glasgow, *Maclehose, Macmillan*. 4s. 6d.

— Memorabilia. Book 1. Edited, with notes, by Rev. C. E. Moberly. New and revised ed. Fcap. 8vo, 82 pp. *Rivingtons*. 2s.

Zimmern (Helen). Heroic Tales Re-told from Firdusi, the Persian. Post 8vo, 386 pp. *Unwin*. 5s.

FRENCH.

Antoine (Ferdinand). Syntaxe de la langue latine. In-8. *Vieweg*. 8 fr. Carletti (P. V.) Méthode théorico-pratique de la langue arabe. In-4 auto-graphié. Bruxelles, *Leroux*. 10 fr.

Derenbourg (H.) Le Livre de Sibawaihi. Traité de grammaire arabe. 2 vols. 8vo, 320 pp. Paris, 1885. m. 30.

Maspero (G.) Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes. Vol. VII, Livr. 1. 8vo. Paris, 1886. Preis für Vol. VII, m. 40.

Reinach (S.) Traité d'épigraphie grecque, précédé d'un Essai sur les inscriptions grecques par C. T. Newton, traduit avec l'autorisation de l'auteur. Gr. in-8. *Leroux*. 20 fr.

Reinach (S.) Grammaire latine, à l'usage des classes supérieures et des candidats à la licence ès lettres et aux agrégations. In-8. *Delgrave*. Cart., 5 fr.
Van den Ghely (J.) Essais de mythologie et de philologie comparée. 8vo,
430 pp. Paris, 1885. m. 8.

GERMAN.

Abel (Carl). Einleitung in e. ägyptisch-semitisch-indoeuropäisches Wurzelwörterbuch. 2 Hft., 2 Hälften. Lex.-8, S. 169-224. Leipzig, *Friedrich*. m. 10.

Abhandlungen d. archäologisch-epigraphischen Seminares der Universität Wien. Hrsg. v. O. Benndorf u. E. Bormann. 6 Hft., 1 Tl. gr. 8. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn*, 1886. m. 6. Inhalt: Beiträge zur Geschichte der altgriechischen Tracht v. Frz. Studniczka. Mit 46 Abbildgn. im Text. viii, 143 S.

Aischylos, Agamemnon, griech. text u. deutsche übersetzg. v. Ulr. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. gr. 8, 115 S. Berlin, *Weidmann*. m. 3.

Almkvist (Herm.) Die Bischari-Sprache Tü-Bedawie in Nordost-Afrika, beschreibend u. vergleichend dargestellt. 2 Bd. Bischari-deutsches u. deutsch-bischar. Wörterbuch, nebst arab. Wortverzeichnisse. gr. 4, v, 113 S. Upsala, *Akadem. Buchhandlung*. m. 10.

Aristophanis comoediae. Annotatione critica, commentario exegetico, et scholiis graecis instruxit Fredericus H. M. Blaydes. Pars XII. gr. 8. Halle, *Buchh. d. Waisenhäuses*, 1885. m. 9. Inhalt: Aristophanis deperditarum comoediarum fragmenta. Auxit, novo ordine digessit, recensuit et annotatione partim aliorum selecta instruxit F. H. M. B. xiv, 491 S.

Arnoldi Lubecensis Gregorius peccator de teutonico Hartmanni de Aue in latinum translatus. Hrsg. von Dr. Gust. v. Buchwald. gr. 8, xxv, 127 S. Kiel, *Homann*, 1886. m. 3.

Aronis (Christos). Χρίστης Γραμματικός. Dissertatio philologica. gr. 8, 38 S. Jena, *Pohle*. m. 1.

Avesta. Die heil. Bücher der Parsen, im Auftrag der kaiserl. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien hrsg. v. Karl F. Geldner. I. Yasna. 2 Lfg. Imp.-4, S. 81-160. Stuttgart, *Kohlhammer*. à m. 8.

— The Sacred Books of the Parsis, edited by Karl F. Geldner. I. Yasna. Fasc. 2. Imp.-4, S. 81-160. Ebd. à m. 12.50.

Bacher (Wilh.) Die hebräisch-neuhebräische u. hebräisch-aramäische Sprachvergleichung d. Abulwalid Merwân Ibn Ganâh. [Aus "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8, 40 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* m. —60.

Bachofen (J. J.) Antiquarische Briefe vornehmlich zur Kenntniß der ältesten Verwandtschaftsbegriffe. 2 Bd. XXXI-LXI. gr. 8, iv, 244 S. Strassburg, *Trübner*, 1886. m. 4.

Baebler (J. J.) Beiträge zu e. Geschichte der lateinischen Grammatik im Mittelalter. gr. 8, vii, 206 S. Halle, *Buchh. d. Waisenhäuses*. m. 3.60.

Baier (Bruno). De Plauti fabularum recensionibus Ambrosiana et Palatina commentatio critica. gr. 8, vi, 191 S. Breslau, *Koebner*. m. 4.80.

Bartholomae (Chrñ.) Arische Forschungen. 2 Hft. gr. 8, viii, 223 S. Halle, *Niemeyer*, 1886. m. 7.

Bertelsmann (Karl). Üb. die verschiedenen Formen der Correlation in der Structur der Relativsätze d. ältern Latein. Diss. gr. 8, 56 S. Jena, *Neuenhahn*. m. 1.

Bibliothek, assyriologische, hrsg. v. Frdr. Delitzsch u. Paul Haupt. 4 Bd., Lfg. u. 6 Bd. gr. 4. Leipzig, *Hinrichs' Verl.* m. 54. Inhalt: IV. Alphabetisches Verzeichniss der assyrischen u. akkadischen Wörter im 2 Bde. der "Cuneiform inscriptions of Western Asia," sowie mehrerer anderer meist unveröffentlichter Inschriften. Mit zahlreichen Ergänzgn. u. Verbessergn. der Texte nach den Thontafeln d. Brit. Museums v. J. N. Strassmaier, S. J. 5 Lfg. S. 769-960. m. 24.—VI. Babylonische Busspsalmen, umschrieben, übers. u. erklärt v. Dr. Heinr. Zimmern. x, 119 S. m. 30.

Bibliothek indogermanischer Grammatiken, bearb. v. F. Bücheler, B. Delbrück, K. Foy, etc. 1 Bd. gr. 8. Leipzig, *Breitkopf & Härtel.* m. 5; geb. m. 6.50. Inhalt: Grundzüge der Phonetik v. Ed. Sievers. 3 verb. Aufl. xvi, 255 S.

— phonetische, hrsg. v. Wilh. Vietor. 1 Hft. 8. Heilbronn, *Henninger*, 1886. m. 1.20. Chrp. Frdr. Hellwag, *dissertatio de formatione loquelae [1781]*. Neudruck, besorgt v. Wilh. Vietor. iv, 60 S.

Böhlingk (Otto). Sanskrit-Wörterbuch in kürzerer Fassung. 6 Thl., 1 Lfg. Imp.-4, 160 S. St. Petersburg. Leipzig, *Voss' Sort.* m. 4.20.

Brachmann (Frdr.) *Quaestiones Pseudo-Diogenianae*. [Aus "Jahrbb. f. class. Philol., 14 Suppl.-Bd."] gr. 8, 78 S. Leipzig, *Teubner.* m. 1.60.

Brand (Aug.) *De dialectis aeolicis quae dicuntur particula I.* Diss. gr. 8, 77 S. Berolini. Leipzig, *Fock.* m. 1.20.

Buchholz (E.) *Die homerischen Realien.* 3 Bd. Die religiöse u. sittl. Weltanschaug. der homer. Griechen. 2 [Schluss]-Abth. gr. 8, xvi, 410 S. Leipzig, *Engelmann.* m. 6. (cpl., m. 3.5.)

Caesaris (C. Julii). *Commentarii de bello gallico.* Hrsg. v. Prof. Herm. Rheinhard. 5 verb. u. verm. Aufl. gr. 8, vi, 249 S. Stuttgart, *Neff*, 1886. m. 2.70; geb., m. 3.10.

Calvary's philologische u. archaeologische Bibliothek. 81 u. 82 Bd. 8. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* Subscr.-Pr. à m. 1.50; Einzelpr. à m. 2. Griechische Geschichte von ihrem Ursprunge bis zum Untergange der Selbständigkeit d. griechischen Volkes v. Adf. Holm. 4 Bde. in ca. 20 Lfgn. 1 Bd. Geschichte Griechenlands bis zum Ausgange d. 6 Jahrh. v. Ch. 1 u. 2 Lfg. 192 S.

Catulli, Tibulli, Propertii carmina a Maur. Hauptio recognita. Ed. Vab Joh. Vahleno curata. 16, 372 S. m. Titelbl. in Stahlst. Leipzig, *Hirzel.* m. 2.50; geb. m. Goldschn., m. 3.75.

Christ (W.) Platonische Studien. [Aus "Abhandlgn. d. k. b. Akad. d. Wiss."] gr. 4, 60 S. München, *Frans' Verl. in Comm.* m. 1.80.

Christus patiens. Tragoedia christiana, quae inscribi solet Χριστὸς πάσχων. Gregorio Nazianzeno falso attributa. Rec. J. G. Brambs. 8, 172 S. Leipzig, *Teubner.* m. 2.25.

Ciceronis (M. Tulli). Brutus de claris oratoribus. Rec. Th. Stangl. 8, xxvi, 89 S. Leipzig, *Freytag*, 1886. m. —80.

— Orator ad M. Brutum. Rec. Th. Stangl. 8, xiv, 68 S. Ebd. m. —60.

Comoediae elegiacae. Ed., commentario critico instruxit, prolegomena scripsit Ernestus Muellenbach, Phil. Dr. Fasc. 1. Vitalis Aulularia. 8, 93 S. Bonn, *Weber.* m. 2.

Corpusculum poesis epicae graecae ludibundae. Fasc. II. Sillographorum graecorum reliquiae, recognovit et enarravit Curtius Wachsmuth. Praecedit

- commentatio de Timone Phliasio ceterisque sillographis. 8, 214 S. Leipzig, Teubner. m. 3.
- Curschmann (Fritz). Horaz. Entdeckungen u. Forschgn. v. R. Bobrik. 1 Thl., angezeigt v. F. C. gr. 8, 90 S. Darmstadt, Jonghaus. m. —80.
- Diels (H.) Üb. die Berliner Fragmente der 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία d. Aristoteles. Mit 2 (lith.) Taf. [Aus "Abhandlgn. d. k. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Berlin."] gr. 4, 57 S. Berlin, Dümmler's Verl. cart. m. 4.
- Dieterici (Fr.) Die Abhandlungen der Ichwān Es-Safā in Auswahl. Zum ersten Mal aus arab. Handschriften hrsg. 3 Hft. gr. 8, xix u. S. 369—623. Leipzig, Hinrichs' Verl., 1886. m. 8. (cpl. m. 20.)
- Dionysi Halicarnasensis antiquitatum romanarum quae supersunt, ed. Carol. Jacoby. Vol. I. 8, viii, 403 S. Leipzig, Teubner. m. 3.60.
- Dissertationes philologicae Argentoratenses selectae. Vol. VIII. gr. 8, 300 S. Strassburg, Trübner. m. 6. (I—VIII, m. 52.)
- Euripidis Hippolytus, scholarum in usum ed. Th. Barthold. [Metra rec. W. Christ.] 8, 77 S. Prag, Tempsky. Leipzig, Freytag. m. —50.
- Euting (Jul.) Nabatäische Inschriften aus Arabien. Hrsg. m. Unterstützg. der königl. preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften. gr. 4, 97 S. m. 29 Lichtdr. Taf. Berlin, G. Reimer. cart. m. 24.
- Ferrette (Jul.) Ulysses Panhellenen, poema heroicum, graecas radices universas in versibus 617 continens. gr. 8, xii, 92 S. Leipzig, Matthes, 1886. m. 2.
- Festi breviarium rerum gestarum populi romani. Ed. Carl Wagener. 8, xiv, 23 S. Prag, Tempsky, 1886. Leipzig, Freytag. m. —50.
- Fick (Aug.) Die homerische Ilias, nach ihrer entstehg. betrachtet u. in der ursprüngl. sprachform wiederhergestellt. 1 Hälfte. gr. 8, xxxvi, 288 S. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprechl's Verl. m. 10.
- Forcellini (Aegid.) Totius latinitatis lexicōn. Pars altera sive onomasticon totius latinitatis, opera et studio Dr. Vinc. De-Vit lucubratum. Distr. 27. gr. 4, 3 Bd. S. 473—552. Prati. Leipzig, Brockhaus' Sort. à m. 2.50.
- Friis (J. A.) Lexicon lapponicum. Fasc. 2. 8vo, pp. 161—320. Christianiae, 1885. Leipzig, F. A. Brockhaus' Sortiment u. Antiq. S. oben Nr. 2614. m. 4.
- Ganjesháyágán Andarze Átrepát Márás-pandán, Mádigáne Chatrang, and Andarze Khusroe Kavátán. By Peshutan Dastur Behramji Sanjana. gr. 8, vii, 71; xxiii, 57 u. 120 S. Bombay. Leipzig, Harrassowitz in Comm. geb., m. 20.
- Gebhardi (Walther). E. ästhetischer Kommentar zu den lyrischen Dichtungen d. Horaz. Essays. gr. 8, viii, 335 S. Paderborn, F. Schöningh. m. 4; geb., m. 5.
- Gellii (A.) Noctium atticarum libri XX ex recensione et cum apparatu critico Martini Hertz. Vol. II. gr. 8, cli, 534 S. Berlin, Hertz. m. 15. (cpl. m. 25.)
- Gercke (Alfr.) Chrysippea. [Aus "Jahrb. f. class. Philol., 14 Suppl.-Bd."] gr. 8, 91 S. Leipzig, Teubner. m. 2.
- Gilbert (Gust.) Handbuch der griechischen Staatsalterthümer. 2 [Schluss-] Bd. gr. 8, viii, 426 S. Leipzig, Teubner. à m. 5.60.
- Gottlieb (E.) Unsere Sprache und unsere Schrift. 8vo, iii, 110 pp. Leipzig, Pfau, 1885. m. 1.60.
- Grimm (Jac.) und Grimm (W.) Deutsches Wörterbuch. 6 Bd., 15 Lfg.

Bearbeitet von M. Heyne. 8vo, viii, Sp. 2689-2848. Leipzig, *Hirzel*, 1885. m. 2.

Grumme (Alb.) *Ciceronis orationis Sestianae dispositio*. gr. 8, 15 S. Gera, *Kanitz's Sort.* Sept.-Cto. m. —40.

Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft. Hrsg. v. Iwan Müller. 2 Halbbbd. gr. 8, 2 Bd. xiii-xx u. S. 289-624. Nördlingen, *Beck*. à m. 5.50.

Hanusz (Joh.) Üb. das allmäßige Umsichgreifen der *n*-Declination im Alt-indischen. [Aus "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8, 45 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* m. —70.

Hellmers (Gh.) Ueber die Sprache Robert Mannyngs of Brunne und über die Autorschaft der ihm zugeschriebenen "Meditations on the Supper of our Lord." 8vo, 96 pp. Goslar, *Koch*, 1885. m. 2.40.

Hillebrandt (Alfr.) *Veda Chrestomathie*. 8vo, vi, 130 pp. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1885. m. 1.60.

Holwerda (A. E. J.) Die alten Kyprier in Kunst u. Cultus. Studien. Mit mehren lith. Abbildgn. 7 Taf. u. 1 Lichtdr.-Taf. gr. 8, xii, 61 S. Leiden, *Brill*. m. 4.50.

Horn (Paul). Die Nominalflexion im Avesta u. den altpersischen Keilinschriften. 1 Tl. Die Stämme auf Spiranten. Diss. gr. 8, 65 S. Halle. Leipzig, *Stauffer*. m. 1.10.

Hübschmann (H.) Das indogermanische Vocalsystem. gr. 8, v, 191 S. Strassburg, *Trübner*. m. 4.50.

Inscriptiones antiquae orae septentrionalis Ponti Euxini graecae et latinae. Ed. M. Basilius Latyschev. Vol. I. Imp.-4, viii, 243 S. St. Petersburg. Leipzig, *Voss' Sort.* m. 20.

Jahrbücher f. classische Philologie. Hrsg. v. Alfr. Fleckeisen. 14 Suppl.-Bd. 2 Hft. gr. 8, iii u. S. 339-781. *Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 8. (14 Suppl.-Bd. cplt., m. 14.)

Kaempf (Wilh.) De pronominalium personalium usu et collocatione apud poetas scaenicos Romanorum. [Aus "Berliner Studien f. class. Philol. u. Archäol."] gr. 8, 48 S. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.*, 1886. m. 1.60.

Kayser (Hm.) Zur Syntax Molière's. 8vo, 50 pp. Kiel, *Lipsius & Tischer*, 1885. m. 1.20.

Klemenz (P.) Der syntactische Gebrauch des Particium Praesentis und des Gerundiums im Altfranzösischen. 8vo, 46 pp. Breslau, *Köhler*, 1884. m. 1.

Körner (Aug. Emil). De epistulis a Cicerone post redditum usque ad finem anni u. c. 700 datis quaestiones chronologicae. gr. 8, 67 S. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 1.

Kuhl (Jos.) Beiträge zur griechischen Etymologie. I. Δῖa bei Homer. gr. 8, iii, 128 S. Prag, *Tempsky*. Leipzig, *Freytag*. m. 3.

Leskien (A.) Untersuchungen über Quantität und Betonung in den slavischen Sprachen. I. Die Quantität im Serbischen. 8vo, 152 pp. Leipzig, *Hirzel*, 1885. m. 5.

Melber (J.) Üb. die Quellen u. den Wert der Strategemensammlung Polyäns. Ein Beitrag zur griech. Historiographie. [Aus "Jahrb. f. class. Philol.", 14 Suppl.-Bd."] gr. 8, 270 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 6.

Meyer (Paul Erich). Quaestiones grammaticae ad Scauri artem restituendam spectantes. Diss. gr. 8, 70 S. Jena, *Neuenhahn*. m. 2.20.

- Miller (Otto). *De decretis atticis quaestiones epigraphicae.* gr. 8, 57 S. Breslau, *Marusche & Berendt.* m. 1.
- Mueller (Adph.) *Questiones Socraticeae.* 4, 36 S. Döbeln, 1877. Leipzig, *Fock.* m. 1.
- Müller (Frdr.) *Grundriss der Sprachwissenschaft.* 3 Bd., 2 Abth., 2 Hälften. Die Sprachen der mittelländ. Rasse. gr. 8, S. 225-480. Wien, *Hölder,* 1886. m. 5.40. (I-III, 2, m. 41.40.)
- Neupert (Alb.) *De Demosthenicarum quae seruntur epistularum fide et auctoritate.* gr. 8, 78 S. Leipzig, *Fock.* m. 1.50.
- Nöldeke (Thdr.) *Üb. Mommsen's Darstellung der römischen Herrschaft u. römischen Politik im Orient.* [Aus "Ztschr. d. Deutschen Morgenländ. Gesellsch."] gr. 8, 21 S. Leipzig, *Brockhaus' Sort.* m. 1.50.
- Oesterlen (Thdr.) *Komik u. Humor bei Horaz.* Ein Beitrag zur röm. Litteraturgeschichte. 1 Hft. Die Satiren u. Epoden. gr. 8, 135 S. Stuttgart, *Metzler's Verl.* m. 3.
- Ovidi Nasonis (P.) *Heroines.* Apparatu critico instruxit et ed. Henr. Steph. Sedlmayer. gr. 8, xvii, 177 S. Wien, *Konegen,* 1886. m. 5.
- Pauli (Carl). *Altitalische Forschungen.* 1 Bd. Die Inschriften nordetruskischen Alphabets. Mit 7 lith. Taf. gr. 8, viii, 131 S. Leipzig, *Barth.* m. 9.
- Pfizmaier (A.) *Vier Himmel d. Jamáto-Liedes.* Erklärungen buddhist. Dichtungen. gr. 8, 82 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* m. 1.20.
- Plauti (T. Macci). *Comoediae, recognovit Frdr. Leo.* Vol. I. Amphitruonem, Asinariam, Aululariam, Bacchides continens. gr. 8, x, 178 S. Berlin, *Weidmann.* m. 1.80.
- Poetae lyrici graecae minores, ed. Joh. Pomtow. 2 vols. 16, 356 u. 396 S. m. 1 Titelbl. in Stahlst. Leipzig, *Hirzel.* m. 5; geb. m. Goldschn., m. 7.
- Prellwitz (Walther). *De dialecto thessalica.* gr. 8, 63 S. Göttingen, *Vandenhoek & Ruprecht's Verl.* m. 1.40.
- Reinhardstoettner (Carl v.) *Plautus.* Spätere Bearbeitgn. plautin. Lustspiele. gr. 8, xvi, 793 S. Leipzig, *Friedrich,* 1886. m. 18.
- Reisch (Emil). *De musicis Graecorum certaminibus capita IV.* gr. 8, 124 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn.* m. 4.
- Richter (Frz.) *De thesauris Olympiae effossis.* gr. 8, 46 S. m. 1 Grundriss. Berlin, *Weidmann.* m. 2.
- Richter (W.) *Die Sklaverei im griechischen Altertume.* gr. 8, 168 S. Breslau, *F. Hirt,* 1886. m. 2.50.
- Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften. Hrsg. v. Dr. Herm. Collitz. 2. Bd., 1 Hft. gr. 8. Göttingen, *Vandenhoek & Ruprecht's Verl.* m. 3.60. (I u. II, 1, m. 17.60.) Inhalt: Die epirotischen, akarnanischen, aetolischen, aenianischen u. phthiotischen Inschriften v. Aug. Fick. Die lokrischen u. phokischen Inschriften v. Fritz Bechtel. 80 S.
- Sanders (Dn.) *Ergänzungs-Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache.* Mit Belegen von Luther bis auf die neueste Gegenwart. 33-40 Lfg. 4to, vi, pp. 513-691. Berlin, *Abenheim,* 1885. Jede Lfg., m. 1.25.
- Schaefer (Arnold). *Abriss der Quellenkunde der griechischen u. römischen Geschichte.* 2 Abtlg. Römische Geschichte bis auf Justinian. 2 Aufl., besorgt v. Heinr. Nissen. gr. 8, x, 208 S. Leipzig, *Taubner.* m. 3.20.

- Demosthenes u. seine Zeit. 2 rev. Ausg., 1 Bd. gr. 8, xvi, 528 S. m. 1 Holzschnatf. Leipzig, Teubner. m. 10.
- Schäfer (Ernst). Nepos-Vokabular. 2 Tl. gr. 8, iv, 43 S. Leipzig, Teubner. cart. à m. —40.
- Scherer (Chrn.) De Olympionicarum statuis. Diss. gr. 8, 58 S. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. m. 1.60.
- Schliemann (Heinr.) Tiryns. Der prähistor. Palast der Könige v. Tiryns. Mit Vorrede v. F. Adler u. Beiträgen v. W. Dörpfeld. Mit 188 Abbildgn., 24 Taf. in Chromolith., 1 Karte u. 4 Plänen. - Lex.-8, lxviii, 487 S. Leipzig, Brockhaus, 1886. m. 32; geb., m. 35.
- Schoendoerffer (Otto). De genuina Catonis de agricultura libri forma. Pars I. De syntaxi Catonis. Diss. gr. 8, 89 S. Königsberg, Koch & Reimer. m. 1.
- Schrader (Eb.) Die Keilinschriften am Eingange der Quellgrotte d. Sebeneh-Su. Mit 1 (Lichtdr.-)Taf. [Aus "Abhandlgn. d. k. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Berlin."] gr. 4, 31 S. Berlin, Dümmler's Verl. in Comm. m. 3.
- Sittl (Karl). Geschichte der griechischen Literatur bis auf Alexander den Grossen. 2 Tl. gr. 8, x, 494 S. München, Th. Ackermann's Verl., 1886. m. 6.50. (1 u. 2, m. 11.30.)
- Slameczka (Frz.). Untersuchungen üb. die Rede d. Demosthenes v. der Gesandtschaft. gr. 8, 48 S. Wien, Hölder. m. 1.60.
- Smyth (Herbert Weir). Der Diphthong *ei* im Griechischen, unter Berücksicht. seiner Entsprechgn. in verwandten Sprachen. gr. 8, §2 S. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht's Verl. m. 1.80.
- Sophokles' Tragoedien. Erklärt v. C. Schmelzer. 3 u. 4 Bd. gr. 8. Berlin, Habel. à m. 1.80; Schulbd. à m. —30; Leinw.-Bd. à m. 1. Inhalt: 3. Antigone. 130 S.—4. Electra. 149 S.
- Sprachproben, altenglische, nebst einem Wörterbuche, herausgegeben von Ed. Münnzner. II Bd. Wörterbuch. 9 Lfg., 2 Abth. 8vo, pp. 385—558. Berlin, Weidmann, 1885. m. 4.80.
- Stein (Ludw.) Die Psychologie der Stoa. 1 Bd. Metaphysisch-anthropolog. Tl. [Aus "Berliner Studien f. class. Philol. u. Archäol."] gr. 8, viii, 216 S. Berlin, Calvary & Co. m. 7.
- Studien, Berliner, f. classische Philologie u. Archäologie. 3 Bd., 1 Hft. gr. 8, iv, 216 S. Berlin, Calvary & Co., 1886. Subscr.-Pr. baar m. 5.60; Einzelp. m. 7.
- Studien, englische. Hrsg. von Eug. Kölbing. IX Bd. 8vo, 1 Heft, 200 pp. Heilbronn, Henninger, 1885. m. 15.
- Thukydides. Mit erklär. Anmerkgn. hrsg. v. K. W. Krüger. 1 Bds., 2 Hft. [III-IV Buch.] 3 Aufl., besorgt v. W. Pökel. gr. 8, iii, 219 S. Leipzig, K. W. Krüger. m. 3.
- Unger (Geo. Frdr.) Die troische Aera d. Suidas. [Aus "Abhandlgn. d. k. bayer. Akad. d. Wiss."] gr. 4, 93 S. München, Franz' Verl. in Comm. m. 2.70.
- Unrein (Otto). De Aviani aetate. Diss. gr. 8, 64 S. Jena, Neuenhahn. m. 2.
- Urlichs (L. v.) Archaeologische Analekten. Programm d. v. Wagner'schen Kunstinstituts. gr. 8, 23 S. Würzburg, Stahel in Comm. m. —80.
- Vambéry (Hm.) Die Scheibaniade. Ein özbegisches Heldengedicht in 76

Gesängen von Prinz Mohammed Salih aus Charezm. Text, Uebersetzung und Noten. 8vo, xxi, 468 pp. Budapest, *Kilián*, 1885. m. 30.

Volkmann (Rich.) Die Rhetorik der Griechen u. Römer, in systemat. Übersicht dargestellt. 2 vielfach verm. u. verb. Aufl. gr. 8, xvi, 595 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 12.

Winkler (H.) Das Uralaltaische und seine Gruppen. 1 u. 2 Lfg. 8vo, viii, 184 pp. Berlin, *Dümmler's Verl.*, 1885. m. 3.60.

Winther (Herm.) De fastis Verrii Flacci ab Ovidio adhibitis. Diss. gr. 8, 57 S. Berlin, *Gaertner*. m. 1. 2.

Wüstenfeld (F.) Die Scherife v. Mekka im XI [XVII] Jahrh. Fortsetzung der Geschichte der Stadt Mekka m. 1 Stammtaf. der Scherife. [Aus "Abhandlgn. der k. Gesellsch. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen."] gr. 4, 94 S. Göttingen, *Dieterich's Verl.* m. 4.

Zielinski (Th.) Die Märchenkomödie in Athen. [Aus "Jahresbericht der deutschen Schulen zu St.-Annen f. 1885."] Lex.-8, 72 S. St. Petersburg, *Kranz*. m. 2.50.

SPANISH.

Fabié (A.) Estudio filológico. 4to, 143 pp. Madrid, 1885. m. 3.20.

Garcés, G. Fundamento del vigor y elegancia de la lengua castellana, expuesto en el propio y vario uso de sus particulas. 2 tomos in 1 vol. 4to, cxliii, 335, 364 pp. Madrid, 1885. m. 16.

SWEDISH.

Kantzow (St. G. de). Harald Ejesons saga. 8vo, 134 pp. Stockholm, 1885. m. 3.

Lyttkens (J. A.) och Wulff (F. A.) Svenska språkets gudlära och beteckningslära, jämte en afhandling om aksent. 8vo, xi, 351, 115 pp. Mit 2 Taf. Lund, 1885. m. 9.75.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Aeschylus. Prometheus. Ed. by H. M. Stephenson, M.A. (Elementary Classics.) London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1885. 40 cts.

Altfranzösische Bibliothek. Herausg. v. Wendelin Förster. Neunter Band. Adgars Marien-Legenden. Herausg. v. Carl Neuhaus. 8 m.

— Zehnter Band. Commentar zu den ältesten französischen Sprachdenkmälern. Herausg. v. Eduard Koschwitz. I. Eide, Eulalie, Jonas, Hohes Lied, Stephan. Heilbronn, *Gebr. Henninger*, 1886. 5 m. 80 pf.

Andresen (Karl Gustav). Sprachgebrauch u. Sprachrichtigkeit im Deutschen. 4te Aufl. Heilbronn, *Gebr. Henninger*. 5 m.

Aristotle, The Politics of. Translated into English, with introduction, marginal analysis, essays, notes and indices. By B. Jowett. Vol. I. Containing the introduction and translation. Vol. II, Pt. I. Notes. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1885.

Barton (E. L.) Language Lessons in Arithmetic and Oral and Written Exercises. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1885. 85 cts.

Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum. Edita curante Carolo Schenkl. Lipsiae, *G. Freytag*. Prague, *F. Tempsky*.

Caesaris (C. Julii). Commentarii de Bello Gallico. Scholarum in usum ed. Ignatius Prammer. 1884. 1 m. 10 pf.

Prammer (Ignaz). Schulwörterbuch zu Cäsar's Commentarii de bello Gallico. Mit vielen in den Text gedruckten Figuren. 1884. 1 m. 60 pf.

Ciceronis, Brutus de Claris Oratoribus. Recensuit Th. Stangl. 1886. 48 kr.

— Libri qui ad Rem publicam et ad Philosophiam spectant. Scholarum in usum ed. Theodorus Schiche. Vol. IX. Cato Maior de Senectute, Laelius de Amicitia. 50 pf.

— Orationes Selectae. Scholarum in usum ed. Hermanus Nohl. Vol. I. Oratio pro Sex. Roscio Amerino. 30 pf. Vol. II. In Q. Caecilium Divinatio. In C. Verrem Accusationis Lib. IV, V. 80 pf.

— Orator. Rec. Th. Stauf. 1885. 60 pf.

Euripidis Hippolytus. Scholarum in usum Ed. Th. Barthold. Metra recensuit W. Christ. 1885. 30 pf.

Festi Breviarium Rerum Gestarum Populi Romani. Ed. Carolus Wagener. 1885. 50 pf.

Horati (Q. H. Flacci) Carmina. Scholarum in usum ed. Michael Petschenig. 1 m. 40 pf.

Livi (T.) Ab urbe condita Libri. Scholarum in usum ed. Antonius Zingerle. Pars IV, Lib. XXVI-XXX. 1 m. 20 pf.

Nepotis (Cornelii) Vitae. Scholarum in usum recensuit et emendavit Andreas Weidner. 1884. 60 pf.

- Ovidi (P. O. Nasonis) Carmina. Edd. Sedlmayer, Zingerle, GÜTHLING.
 Vol. I. Metamorphoses, ed. A. Zingerle. 1884. 1 m. 25 pf.
 — Vol. III. Fasti, Tristium Libri, Ibis, Epistulae ex Ponto, Halieutica, Fragmenta. Scholarum in usum ed. OTTO GÜTHLING. 1885. 2 m.
 — Carmina selecta. Scholarum in usum ed. H. S. Sedlmayer. 80 pf.
 Jurenka (Hugo). Schulwörterbuch zu H. S. Sedlmayer's P. Ovidi Nasonis carmina selecta. Mit vielen in den Text gedruckten Figuren. 1885. 1 m. 60 pf.
- Sallusti (C. S. Crispi) Bellum Catilinae. Bellum Iugurthinum. Ex Historiis quae extant orationes et epistulae. Rec. Aug. Scheindler. 1883. 1 m.
 — Bellum Catilinae. 1885. 35 pf.
- Sophoclis Oedipus Rex. Scholarum in usum ed Fridericus Schubert. 1883. Ajax, 1883. Antigone, 1883. Philoctetes, 1884. Electra, 1884. @ 40 pf.
- Taciti (Cornelii) Opera quae supersunt. Recensuit Ioannes Müller. Vol. I. Libros ab excessu D. Augusti continens. 1884. 1 m. 50 pf.
- Brinton (D. G.) Polysynthesis and Incorporation as Characteristics of American Language. Philad., Penna., 1885.
- Brinton's Library of Aboriginal American Literature. No. VI. The Annals of the Cakchiquels. By Daniel G. Brinton. Philadelphia, 1885.
- Campbell (L.), and Abbott (Evelyn). Sophocles. For the Use of Schools. Edited, with introduction and notes. Vol. I. Text. Vol. II. Notes. Oxford, At the Clarendon Press, 1886.
- Euripides' Bacchantes. Edited on the basis of Wecklein's edition. Boston, Ginn & Co., 1885. Text, 22 cts.; Text and Notes, \$1.15.
- Faust von Goethe. Mit Einleitung u. fortlaufender Erklärung, herausg. von K. J. Schröer. Erster Theil. Zweite, durchaus revidirte Aufl. Heilbronn, Gebr. Henninger, 1886. 3 m. 75 pf.
- Ferguson (E. C.) Questions on Caesar and Xenophon. Boston, Ginn & Co. \$1.25.
- Fick (Aug.) Die Homerische Ilias nach ihren entstehung betrachtet u. in der ursprünglichen sprachform wiederhergestellt. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht, 1885. 10 m.
- Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft in systematischen Darstellung. Herausg. von Iwan Müller. 1ste Hälfte von Band I. Nördlingen, C. H. Beck's Buchhandlung, 1885.
- Harding (B. F.) Greek Inflection. Object Lessons in Greek Philology. Boston, Ginn & Co., 1886. 55 cts.
- Hübner (E.) Neue Studien über den Römischen Grenzwall in Deutschland. Mit einer Tafel. Bonn, Carl Georgi, 1885.
- Indo-Germanische Grammatiken. Band II. Supplement. The roots, verb-forms and primary derivatives of the Sanskrit language. By William Dwight Whitney. Leipzig, Breitkopf u. Härtel. London, Trübner & Co., 1885.
- Jordan (H.) Topographie der Stadt Rom im Alterthum. Erster Band. Zweite Abtheilung. Mit fünf Tafeln Abbildungen u. einem Plan. Berlin, Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung, 1885. 8 m.
- Keller (O.) Der Saturnische Vers als rhythmisch erwiesen. Prag, F. Tempsky. Leipzig, G. Freytag, 1882.

Lehmann (C. A.) *Quaestiones Tullianae. Pars Prima. De Ciceronis Epistulis.* Pragae, *F. Tempsky.* Lipsiae, *F. Freytag,* 1885.

Mackie (E. C.) *Parallel Passages for Translation into Greek and English.* London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.,* 1885. (Through Cushing & Bailey, Balto.) \$1.10.

Mayor (J. B.) *M. Tulli Ciceronis De Natura Deorum Libri Tres.* With introduction and commentary. Together with a new collation of several of the English MSS. By J. H. Swainson. Vol. III. Cambridge, *At the University Press.* New York, *Macmillan & Co.,* 1885. \$2.75.

Mittheilungen des Deutschen Archaeologischen Instituts in Athen. Zehnter Band, Drittes Heft. Bei Karl Wilberg, 1885.

Montgomery (D. H.) *The Leading Facts of English History.* Boston, *Ginn & Co.,* 1886. \$1.12.

Müllenhoff (Karl). *Altdeutsche Sprachproben.* 4te Aufl. Besorgt von Max Rödiger. Berlin, *Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung,* 1885.

Nixon (J. E.) *Prose Extracts, arranged for translation into English and Latin, with general and special prefaces on style and idiom.* Part II. Oratorical, Historical, Philosophic, Miscellaneous. Cambridge, *Macmillan & Bowes,* 1885. (Through Cushing & Bailey.) \$1.00.

Παππάμαρκος. Περὶ τοῦ σκοποῦ τῆς ἐκπαιδεύσεως τῆς Ἑλληνίδος. *Πραγματεία παιδαγωγική ὑπὸ Χαροπίου Παππαμάρκου· ἐν Κερκύρᾳ.* 1885.

Phonetische Bibliothek. Herausg. von Wilhelm Vietor, Christoph. Wilhelm Hellwag. *Dissertatio de formatione loquelae 1781.* Heilbronn, *Gebr. Henninger,* 1886. 1 m. 20 pf.

Platonis Phaedo. *The Phaedo of Plato.* Edited, with introduction and notes, by W. D. Geddes, LL.D., Professor of Greek at the University of Aberdeen. London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.,* 1885. \$2.25.

Plato's Apology of Socrates and Crito. Ed. on the basis of Cron's edition, by Louis Dyer. Boston, *Ginn & Co.,* 1885. \$1.00.

Reisch (Aemilius). *De musicis Graecorum certaminibus. Capita Quattuor.* Vindobonae, Sumptibus et Typis, *C. Geroldi F.,* 1885. 4 m.

Seymour (T. D.) *Introduction to the Language and Verse of Homer.* Boston, *Ginn & Co.,* 1885. 50 cts.

Shakespeare's Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark. Ed. with notes, by Homer B. Sprague, A. M., Ph. D. Chicago, *S. R. Winchell,* 1885. 45 cts.

Smith (W. W.), and Blackwell (R. E.) *A Parallel Syntax-Chart in Latin, Greek, French, English and German.* Boston, *Ginn & Co.,* 1885.

Stangl (Th.) *Der sog. Gronovscholiast zu elf Ciceronischen Reden.* Prag, *F. Tempsky.* Leipzig, *G. Freytag,* 1884. (See A. J. P. V 257.)

Terenti (P.) *Andria.* With notes and introduction, by C. A. Freeman and O. Sloman. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press,* 1885. New York, *Macmillan & Co.* (Through Cushing & Bailey, Balto.) 75 cts.

Varronis (M. Terenti) *de Lingua Latina Libri.* Emendavit, apparatu critico instruxit, praefatus est Leonardus Spengel, Leonardo patre mortuo, edidit et recognovit filius Andreas Spengel. Berlin, *Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung,* 1885. 8 m.

Was (H.) *Plato's Politeia.* Een kritisch-esthetisch Onderzoek. Arnhem, 1885.

- Wentworth (G. A.) Shorter Course in Algebra. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1885.
\$1.10.
- Western (Aug.) Englische Lautlehre für Studirende u. Lehrer. Heilbronn,
Gebr. Henninger, 1885. 2 m.
- Kurze Darstellung der Englischen Aussprache für Schulen u. zum
Selbstunterricht. Heilbronn, *Gebr. Henninger*, 1886. 1 m. 20 pf.
- Wiltse (S. E.) Stories for Kindergartens and Primary Schools. Boston,
Ginn & Co., 1885.

CORRECTIONS.

- p. 114, l. 6 from bottom, for "K.'s," read "P. u. K.'s."
293, l. 4 from bottom, for 1860," read "1880."
312, l. 17 from bottom, for "Haus," read "Haus aus."
401, l. 17 from top, read 'only by *extremely* rough criticism.'
467, l. 3 from bottom, read *iπάρχων*.
12 from bottom, read *Τρωαίων*.
487, l. 15 from bottom, read *τειθοτ' ἀν*,
23 from bottom, read delights" to the end.
488, l. 10 from bottom, read *τὸ ξίφος*.
495, l. 12 from bottom, read Scottish.
496, l. 15 from bottom, read *βίᾳ*.

INDEX VOL. VI.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>Abbott and Rushbrooke's Common Tradition
of the Synoptic Gospels, 99-101</p> <p>Abbott's Evangeliorum Versio Antehieronymiana (rev.), 223-225</p> <p>Abel's Orphica, 400</p> <p>Abraham and Isaac, a Mystery Play, 375</p> <p>Abraham's Studia Plautina, 357-8</p> <p>Absalón, 256</p> <p>Accent, Musical, in Quantitative Poetry
of the Greeks, 383</p> <p>Accusative, Adverbial in Latin, 255</p> <p>Aelian, his bad Greek,
V. H. 13, 9, 114</p> <p>Aeneid, Plüss on the,
Publication of, 242</p> <p><i>agina, aginare</i>, 244</p> <p>Aigis, what? 387</p> <p>Ainesidemos, 380</p> <p>Aischylos :
Ag. 78, 166. 382. 661, 673, 681, 247
Cho. 439, 151
995, 247</p> <p>Choruses in, 505</p> <p>Eum. 68. 209. 211. 251, 381</p> <p>959,</p> <p>Pers. 924, 247</p> <p>Suppl. 210. 513, 579, 247</p> <p>Weil on, 248</p> <p>Albion, 382</p> <p>Alexis, fr. 2, 62,
fr. 116, 155, 172, 187, 200, 288
fr. 234, 267, 289</p> <p>Alkyoneus, 290</p> <p>396</p> <p>ALLEN, FREDERIC D., Greek and Latin
Inscriptions from Palestine, 100-216</p> <p><i>ampla</i> = <i>ansa</i>, 119</p> <p>Anaxilas, fr. 22, 25, 288</p> <p>Anglia, 371-378</p> <p>Antidosis, 116</p> <p>Antiphanes, fr. 171, 2; 190, 5; 194, 15-19 ;
195, 285
fr. 215, 234, 329, 286</p> <p><i>anxia</i> = <i>angor</i>, 120</p> <p>Aor, and pr. part. in Greek, 519</p> <p>Aorists <i>siz</i> and <i>sa</i> in Sanskrit, 275-84</p> <p>Aphrodite, Etymology of, 236</p> <p>Apollodoros, Bibl., 3 12, 6, 8, 250</p> <p>Aratos, 116</p> <p>Archilochos, Conjectures on the text of, 235</p> | <p>Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie u.
Grammatik, 118-120; 252-256; 501-4</p> <p>Ariadne's crown, 507</p> <p>Arminius a Roman name, 261</p> <p>Armpitting among the Greeks, 151-169</p> <p>Arnobius, 7, 3, 10, 248</p> <p>ARROWSMITH, R., Compounded Verb in
the Nala, 481</p> <p>Athenians and Halieis, 388</p> <p>Attic orators, Genitive Absolute in, 310-343</p> <p>Atticism at Rome, 387-8</p> <p>Aurelius Victor and Sallust, 508</p> <p>Axionicus, fr. 2,
<i>bad</i>, Etymology of, 512</p> <p>Baebler's Beiträge zu einer Geschichte der
lateinischen Grammatik im Mittel-
alter, 400</p> <p>BALG, G. H., I-sound in English, 7-24</p> <p>Beowulf and Edda, Figurative mode of
expression in, 513</p> <p>BLOOMFIELD, MAURICE, Four Etymolog-
ical Notes, 41-52</p> <p>Boethius, A.-S. version of the metres of, 373</p> <p>Bonet-Maury's Doctrine des douze Apô-
tres (rev.), 103-4</p> <p>Books Received, 133-4, 273-4, 416-18, 535-38</p> <p>Béal and Bailly's Dictionnaire Etymolo-
gique Latin, 231-2</p> <p>Brief Mention, 121, 262-5, 398-401, 522-25</p> <p>BRIGHT, J. W., Review of Cook's Sievers'
Old English Grammar, 221-223</p> <p>Wagner's Marlowe's Tam-
burlaine, 351-4</p> <p>Review of Harrison and Baskerville's
Groschopf's Grein, 493-5</p> <p>Brinton's The Lenapé and Their Legends
(rev.), 228-9</p> <p>Brugmann's Griechische Grammatik, 398</p> <p>Bünnow's Charidschiten unter den
ersten Omayyaden, 109-10</p> <p>Bull's blood as a poison, 508</p> <p>BUTLER, NICHOLAS MURRAY, Postposi-
tive <i>et</i> in Propertius, 349-50</p> <p><i>bututti</i>, 243</p> <p>Caedmon, Dative and Instrumental in, 376</p> <p>Caesar :
B. A. 8, 2; B. C. 3, 112, 2; 95, 1; B. G.
6, 7, 1; 6, 40, 6, 237</p> <p>Calendar, Roman, 248</p> |
|---|--|

Campbell and Abbott's Sophocles,	522	dortig,	260
Canada, French Language of,	135-150	Dyer-Cron's Apology (noticed),	523
Cassiterides,	382	Edda, Figurative mode of expression in,	513
Catullus:		ehrerbietung,	260
3, 1,	236	ELLIOTT, A. M., Contributions to a His-	
64, 54, 253,	236	tory of the French Language of	
243,	237	Canada,	135-50
Celsus, Opiniones omnium philosophorum,	395	Review of v. Miklosich's Slavo-Deut-	
Chalcidian cities in the revolt of Samos,	385	sches und Slavo-Italienisches,	89-94
Chanson de Roland, Time of,	392	Stengel's Theatre d'Alexan-	
Chrétien de Troyes,	394	dre Hardy,	360-2
Cicero:		ELLIS, ROBINSON, Anecdota Oxoniensia	
<i>Academica</i> , ed. Reid,	355-7	(rev.),	229-30
<i>Cato Major</i> , Haste in composition of,	243	Phillipps Glossary,	451-61
<i>pro Caelio</i> —emended,	248	Remarks on Vol. II of Kock's Comi-	
20,	251	corum Atticorum Fragmenta,	285-295
<i>Epistulae ad Brutum</i> ,	246	Englische Studien,	512-14
<i>N. D.</i> 1, 49,	388	Ennius in the Middle Ages,	242
<i>Orator</i> ,	380	Ephippus, fr. 13,	288
<i>Phil. II</i> 40, 103,	248	equites equo privato,	252
<i>in Pisonem</i> , 81,	113	erhfal, clerical error for erbsal,	258
<i>pro Rab.</i> 5, 17,	252	essay, the derivation of,	462-471
<i>Verr. IV</i> , 128,	512	Etymology :	
Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta, Kock's,	285-95	ācchā, (Vedic),	41
Conflate Readings of the New Testa-		āμβλακεῖν,	46
ment,	25-40	πέπων,	42
Conscription under the Roman Empire,	115-17	usque,	41
Consecutio temporum,	238	Eubulos, fr. 15,	286
COOK, ALBERT S., A Latin Poetical		fr. 37, 2; 105, 115,	287
Idiom in Old English,	476-79	Euripides :	
Report of Englische Studien,	512-14	Bacchae, ed. Sandys,	524
Vowel-length in Old English,	296-309	fr. 200, 385,	370
Cook's Sievers' Old English Grammar		Hec. 1270,	370
(rev.),	221-3	Hel. 656,	505
I Cor. 9, 9,	31	I. T. 782,	235
cordolum,	243	Eutropius, Welch and Duffield's,	500
coromagister,	503	Evander = Effandus,	387
Correspondence,	122-3	Evangeliorum Versio Anteheronymiana	
Allen, F. D. On an Inscription of Ge-		(rev.),	223-5
rasa,	525	exagium,	462 foll.
cum = apud,	253	Farms in Italy,	395
Cymbeline, New Source of Shakespeare's,	372	Faust and Wagner Pantomimes in Eng-	
dare and dha,	386	land,	376
Davenant's Macbeth,	372	Fierabras, Romance of,	372
Dawes's canon,	70	Final Sentence in Greek,	53-73
Dead Sea,	518	Flagg's Seven against Thebes,	401
deinde,	244	Flore and Blanschefur,	259
demagis,	244	Florus, 1, 3, 5; 2, 6, 16,	367
deunx,	244	1, 37,	505
Diodorus, his treatment of Roman his-		Forrest's Theophilus Legend,	371
tory,	247	forsitam,	120
Dionysios, fr. 2,	290	FOWLER, HAROLD N., The ΜΑΣΤΡΟΙ at	
Periegetes,	386	Rhodes,	472-75
Diphilos, fr. 32, 50, 80,	293	French Style, Two Points in,	344-8
Disputationes Morales (<i>διαλέξεις</i>)—ap.		frigidor,	385
Mullach Fr. Phil. I 544-52,	394	frustra and neququam,	252
Dodona, Oracular inscriptions of,	510	Furneaux's Tacitus' Annals,	400
D'Ooge's Sophokles' Antigone (rev.),	94-9	Future in Romance,	501-2
		Galen and Thessalos,	517
		GARNER, SAMUEL, Report of Romania, 391-4	

- GARNETT, JAMES M., Notice of Jahresschrift über die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der germanischen Philologie, 359-60
 Report of Anglia, 371-8
 Review of Skeat's Tale of Gamelyn, 358-9
 Sweet's First Middle English Primer, 354-5
 GATSCHE, A. S., Notice of Jahn's Gregorius Palamas, 233
 Genesis, A. Sax., 377
 Genitive Absolute in the Attic Orators, 340-345
 Germania, 256-61
 Gerund, Origin of name, 502
 GILDERSLEEVE, B. L., Review of Geddes's Phaedo, 495-97
 Review of Hickie's Andocides, 486-90
 Bruno Keil's *Anelecta Isocratea*, 107-9
 Mommsen's Römische Geschichtschreiber, 483-86
 Final Sentence in Greek, 53-73
 Note on πρίν, 482
gleichfalls, 260
 Glossary, Phillipps, 451-61
gomia, 244
 GOMPERZ, TH., Letter from, 193
 Granius, *Aulus*, 245
 Greek:
 ἀμβλακεῖν, 46
 ἀπαγωγή, 507
 ἄρ, ἥα in Skt., 44
 αὐτόκωλος, 235
 διτετῆς and διοπετῆς, 111
 ἔκαστοι in Homer, 238
 ἔπαρχος and ὑπάρχος, 467
 εὑρετα, late form, 518
 ἔξω and not σχήσω preferred in Attic Orators, 508
 καστηρατόριν = καταθηρατόριν, 384
 κίων, 439
 Κύρνος, a proper or a common noun ?, 369
 μαστροί, 472-75
 μασχαλίζειν, 151 foll.
 οικτίρειν not οικτείρειν, 517
 ὄπιον, 518
 πέπων, 42
 πιομαί
 ποσειδάων, 444
 πρίν = ἔως, 482
 προάγον, what ? 384
 Προκόννητος, 519
 πρωτόγονος, 238
 χίλιοι, not a very old form, 437-50
 Greek, Final Sentence in, 53-73
 Gregory and Abbot's Prolegomena to Tischendorf's N. T. (rev.), 105-7
 h, Latin in the fourth century, 392
 habere with inf., 254; 501-2
- Halm, Carl, 366
 Hardy, Alexandre, 360-62
 Harmonia's necklace, 507
 HARRIS, J. RENDEL, Conflate Readings of the New Testament, 25-40
 Review of Abbott's *Evangeliorum Versio Anteieronymiana*, 223-5
 Abbott and Rushbrooke's Common Tradition of the Synoptic Gospels, 95-101
 Bonet-Maury's *Doctrine des douze Apôtres*, 103-4
 Gregory and Abbott's Prolegomena to Tischendorf's N. T., 105-7
 Hitchcock and Brown's Διδαχὴ τῶν ἡβ ἀποστόλων, 104-5
 Spence's Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, 102-3
 Teaching of the Apostles and the Sibylline Books (noticed), 401
 HART, J. M., Review of Zeller's Keltische Studien, 217-20
 Hellwig, de formatione loquela, 525
 Heniochos, fr. 2, 291
 Hermes, 115-18, 394-7
 Herodian, 1, 9, 5, 111
 Herodotus, 4, 8,
 5, 2, 21; 6, 57, 364
 7, 76, 367
 145, 150, 368
 8, 3, 367
 7, 3, 509
 3, 15, 516
 9, 1, 4, 515
 52, 516
 3, 41, 52, 69, 104, 517
 5, 49, 106, 519
 6, 31, 519
 1, 98, 197, 520
 4, 75, 520
 5, 92, 520
 Merriam's (noticed), 262
 his sojourn in Thuria, 236
 Hisperica Famina, 504
 Hippocrates (Ps.) περὶ διαίτης, 235
 Hippys of Rhigion, 396
 Hitchcock and Brown's Διδαχὴ (rev.), 104-5
 Holden's Plutarch's Gracchi (noticed), 264
 Holzweissig's Lateinische Grammatik, 400
 Homer, Codex Lipsiensis, 118
 See Il. and Od.
 Reduction of EI to I in, 429-50
 Homeric Numbers, 509
 Horace, Epistles ed. Wilkins, 264
 Horace, Epistles, edd. Keller et Häussner, 264
 Verrall's Studies in, 264
 Horn, a symbol of cuckoldry, 257
 Horses as sacrifices to river gods, 389
 Hübner's Exempla Scripturæ Epigraphicae, 262-63

Human flesh and swine's flesh,	518	Luke, 15, 29,	27
Sacrifices in Greece,	511	24, 51,	38
HUMPHREYS, M. W., Report of Revue de Philologie,	248-52	Lysias, 1, 29,	57
II. 1, 46, 60,	514	32, 24,	56
66, 173, 555,	515	Epitaphios,	381
5, 46,	515	<i>malum</i> , Gell., 13; 8,	251
5, 770; 8, 349; 12, 283; 13, 754,	363	MARCOU, P. B., Two Points in French Style,	344-48
Leyden scholia to,	396	Mark, 6, 14. 33;	27, 36
Inchoative verbs in Latin,	118-19	9, 38,	36
Inscription, Ephebic,	1-6	Marlowe's Tamburlaine, ed. Wagner,	351-4
Inscription of Gerasa,	525	ΜΑΣΤΡΟΙ at Rhodes,	472-75
Inscriptions, Greek and Latin from Palestine,	190-216	Matth. 1, 7,	26
Oracular, of Dodona,	510	13, 35,	28
interest,	502	21, 9, 15,	30
Isocratea, Analecta,	107-9	<i>mehrmalen</i> ,	260
Isokrates, 5, 154,	57	MERRIAM, A. S., Ephebic Inscription of C. I. G., 282,	1-6
Marseilles papyrus of,	397	Merriam's Herodotos (noticed),	262
I-sound in English,	7-24	Metaphor in Latin from Plautus to Terence,	389
Italy, Farms in,	395	Metaphors, Spanish,	74-85
Jahn's Gregorius Palamas (noticed),	233	von Miklosich's Slavo-Deutsches und Slavo-Italienisches (rev.),	89-94
Jahrbücher, Neue. See Neue Jahrbücher.		Migration Legend of the Creek Indians,	228
Jahresbericht über die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der germanischen Philologie,	359-60	Miltiades and Marathon,	519
James, 5, 10,	31	Mnemosyne, 111-15; 363-71; 514-21	
John, 5, 37,	31	<i>monubilis</i> = μονόβολος,	
Jude, 3,	31	MORRIS, C. D., Report of Mnemosyne,	
Katharsis question,	237	111-15; 363-71; 514-21	
Keil's Analecta Isocratea (rev.),	107-9	Müller, Iwan, Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft,	398-9
Keller and Häussner's Horace,	264	<i>munimerei</i> ,	260
Keltische Studien, Zimmer's (rev.),	217-20	MUNRO, H. A. J., Letter from,	122-3
KITTREDGE, GEORGE LYMAN, Armpitting among the Greeks,	151-69	Naevius in the Middle Ages,	242
The Laughing Loan,	480	Nala, Compounded verb in the,	481
Klearchos, fr. 1,	290	Negro English,	375
Kock's Comicorum Atticorum Frag- mента, Vol. II,	285-95	Nepos or Hyginus?	242
König Rother,	259	Neue Jahrbücher, 234-42; 386-91; 504-12	
Kratinos, fr. 124, 250,	293	New Testament, Conflate Readings of,	25-40
fr. 322, 334, 344, 402,	294	Nikostratos, fr. 17,	287
<i>laf</i> and <i>lafe</i> in Old English,	476	Nomius, 483,	248
LAMBERTON, W. E., On Plato's Theatetos,	85-8	'now . . . now,' how expressed in Latin,	503-4
LANG, HENRY, Spanish Metaphors,	74-85	Od., 1, 414,	365
Latin, Gallic,	253	4, 665,	366
Latin orthography,	369	5,	388
Livy, Macaulay's,	500	6, 63; 9, 264,	365
Legal phraseology in Greek,	55	11, 583,	363
Lenápé and their Legends,	228-9	12, 250; 15, 373; 16, 305,	366
Lesbos, Confiscation of land in,	381	18, 171,	370
Loan, The Laughing,	480	20, 38,	367
Loewe, Gustav, Obituary notice of,	249	23, 839.	363
Long Vowels in Old English, Develop- ment of,	373	Olympia (Bötticher's),	506
Lucan and Petronius,	380	<i>opus</i> , construction,	502
Lucilius, fr. 339 (Lachm.),	381	Oracular inscriptions of Dodona,	510
Lucretius, Lib. V,	390	Orm's double consonants,	374
12, 18,	39	Orrmulum, Sources of,	512
		Ovid:	
		Met. 1, 16,	248

Ovid's <i>Tristia</i> ed. Owen,	525	Plautus :	
Owen's Ovid's <i>Tristia</i> (noticed),	525	Rud. 859. 1226. 1229,	379
Page of poetry, Size of,	390	Transpositions in,	246
Palmyrene tariff,	251, 396	Trin. 1049,	379
<i>pantex</i> ,	243	Truc. Act II, Sc. 1 (superscription),	506
Parataxis,	66	259. 307. 331. 443. 710. 713. 751.	
Patrocles, Voyage of,	116	886,	379
Peisistratos and his administrations,	511	Pliny the Elder :	
Peregrinos Proteus,	381	H. N. 33. 154,	251
PERRIN, B., <i>Pharsalia, Pharsalus, Pala-</i>		Syrian-Greek inscription in honor of,	397
<i>pharsalus</i> ,	170-89	Pliny the Younger :	
* <i>pertusium</i> ,	244	Ep. 8, 4, 1,	237
<i>pestilensisch</i> ,	260	Plutarch's <i>Gracchi</i> ,	264
Petronius and Lucan,	380	Peric. c. 17,	382
Pfeffel,	256	Posthomeric sacrifices in Greece,	511
Pharsalia, Pharsalus, Palaepharsalus,	170-89	POSTGATE, J. P., The Ultimate Deriva-	
Pheidias, Legends on the death of	239	tion of Essay,	462-71
Pherekrates, fr. 92,	294	Postpositive <i>et</i> in Propertius,	349-50
Philemon, fr. 65,	291	<i>Potio</i> ,	245
fr. 88; 91, 3; 96,	292	<i>predator</i> , Juristic meaning of,	503
fr. 109, 172, 173,	293	Pres. and aor. part. in Greek,	519
Phillipps Glossary,	451-61	<i>prestresse</i> , Fate of the,	393
Phlegyan myths,	240	Propertius, first and second books,	383
Pindar and Korinna,	114	Postpositive <i>et</i> in,	349-50
O 1, 7,	111	Ptolemy Lagi, fragment of,	385
2, 15. 56,	234	Pyra und Lange's <i>Freundschaftliche Lie-</i>	
3, 25. 45; 6. 15. 86,	112	der (noticed),	524
7, 1,	234	<i>þungere</i> ,	388
58,	112	<i>quamquam</i> and <i>tamen</i> ,	382
8, 16. 41. 52,	234	- <i>que</i> , - <i>ve</i> , - <i>ne</i> , after short <i>e</i> ,	250
N 9, 23,	112	RADDATZ, C. F., Report of Germania,	256-61
Pitanate λόχος,	515	<i>rifert</i> ,	502
Plato, <i>Comicus</i> , fr. 3,	294	Reid's Cicero's <i>Academica</i> (rev.),	355-7
Dyer-Cron's <i>Apology</i> ,	523	Recent Publications, 124-32; 265-73;	
Gorgias, 483 A, 509 B. C.,	249	402-15; 526-34	
Laches, 196 D,	236	Reduction of EI to Ī in Homer,	419-50
Language as a criterion of chronology,	387	REISCH, de Musicis Graecorum Certa-	
Leges, 855 B,	112	minibus (noticed),	524
864 C, 872 C,	113	Reports :	
954 E,	365	Anglia,	371-8
Resp. 436 D,	333	Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie u.	
485 E, 527 C, 607 C,	370	Grammatik,	118-20; 252-6
558 A,	251	Englische Studien,	518-4
Symp. 174 E,	62	Hermes,	115-18; 394-97
194 A,	384	Mnemosyne,	111-15; 362-71; 514-21
Theaitetos, 169 D,	85-88	Neue Jahrbücher,	234-42; 386-91; 504-12
Plautus :		Revue de Philologie,	248-52
Amphitru. 635,	379	Rheinisches Museum,	242-7; 378-86
Asin. 130,	379	Romania,	391-4
Leonida and Libanus in,	239	Reviews :	
709,	375	Abbott and Rushbrooke's Common	
Aul. 359,	380	Tradition of the Synoptic Gospels, 99-101	
Bacch. 760,	379	Abbott's <i>Evangeliorum Versio Ante-</i>	
Capt. 508. 519. 672,	379	hieronymiana,	223-5
Cist. II 1, 4,	379	Abraham's <i>Studia Plautina</i> ,	357-8
Men. 217,	379	Archiv für Lateinische Lexicographie	
Merc. 16,	379	u. Grammatik,	501-4
Mil. 438, 186. 360. 997. 1207. 1242. 1381, 379-80		Anecdota Oxoniensia,	229-30
Most. 139,	379	Bréal and Bailly's <i>Dictionnaire Étymo-</i>	
Rud. 20. 43,	249	logique Latin,	231-2

Reviews:

- Brünnow's *Charidschiten unter den ersten Omayyaden*, 109-10
 Cook's *Sieters' Old English Grammar*, 221-3
 D'Ooge's *Sophokles' Antigone*, 94-9
 Geddes's *Phaedo*, 495-96
 Harrison and Baskerville's *Groschopp's Grein*, 493-95
 Hickie's *Andocides*, 486-90
 Jahn's *Gregorius Palamas*, 233
Jahresbericht über die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der germanischen Philologie, 359-60
 Macaulay's *Livy, Books XXIII and XXIV*, 500
 von Miklosich's *Slavo-Deutsches und Slavo-Italienisches*, 89-94
 Mommsen's *Römische Geschichte*, 483-86
 Paulsen's *Geschichte des gelehrten Unterrichts*, 490-3
 Reid's *Cicero's Academica*, 355-7
 Schenkl's *Calpurnii et Nemesiani Bucolica*, 499-500
 Skeat's *Tale of Gamelyn*, 358-9
 Stengel's *Theatre d'Alexandre Hardy*, 360-2
 Sweet's *First Middle English Primer*, 354-5
 Uhlig's *Dionysii Thracis Ars Grammatica*, 225-7
 Verrall's *Studies in Horace*, 497-99
 Wagner's *Marlowe's Tamburlaine*, 351-4
 Welch and Duffield's *Eutropius*, 500
 Zimmer's *Keltische Studien*, 217-20
Revue de Philologie, 248-52
 Rheinisches Museum, 242-47; 378-86
 Rhodes, Mastroi at., 472-75
 Roland, Chanson de, Time of, 392
 Romance, Future in, 501-2
 Romania, 391-4
 Roman Soldiers, Marriage of, 252
 Rzach's Hesiod (noticed), 121
 Sabatier's ed. of the Διδαχή, 401
 Sacrifices, Posthomeric, in Greece, 511
 Saintsbury's *Sainte-Beuve*, 522
 Sallust:
 Jug. 78, 2, 367
 Sallust and Aurelius Victor, 508
samentum : sagmen : segmentum : segmen, 243
 Sandys' *Bacchae* (noticed), 524
 Sanskrit, The *sīt* and *sā* aorists in, 275-84
 Seafarer, an Old English poem, 513
 Schenkl's *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Latinorum* (noticed), 121, 400
 Schmidt's Parallel-Homer, 399
 Shakespeare and Puritanism, 375
 Shakespeare's Witches, 372
 Sheba, Legend of the Queen of, 257
 SIHLER, E.G., Report of Hermes, 115-18; 394-7
 Simonides Amorginus, Conjectures on the text of, 235
 Skeat's Tale of Gamelyn (rév.), 358-9
 SMYTH, HERBERT WEIR, Review of Paulsen's *Geschichte des gelehrten Unterrichts*, 490-93
 The Reduction of EI to I in Homer, 419-50
 Sophokles:
 Ai. 473, 522
 Antigone, 755-7, 241
 Campbell and Abbott's, 522
 El. 444, 151
 fr. 140, 152, 593, 5, 381
 Spanish Metaphors, 74-85
 Spence's *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (rev.), 102-3
 SPIEKER, EDWARD H., Genitive Absolute in the Attic Orators, 310-43
 Review of Verrall's *Studies in Horace*, 497-9
 Stratmann, F. H., Notice of, 378
 Stengel's *Theatre d'Alexandre Hardy*, 360-62
stomis, 120
 Strabo's Geography, 117
 Subjunctive of repetition, 248
 Sulpic. Severus, Chron. II, 16, 3, 236
 Sweet's First Middle English Primer (rev.), 354-5
 Swine's flesh and human flesh, 518
 Tacitus:
 Hist. 1, 2, 72, 515
 3, 24, 515
 Terence:
 Hec. 163, 379
 de Than, Philip, 376
 Theognis, 129, 557, 370
 Clemm on the Fragments of, 504-5
 Theophilus legend, 371
 Thereianos, Φιλοτρυγκαὶ Ὑποτυπώσεις, 399
 Thukydides, 3, 36, 2; 82, 5, 241
 4, 14, 2; 113, 2; 117, 2,
 93, 2, 242
 Tibullus and his time, 390
 MSS of, 246
 Timokles, fr. 39, 291
tondeo, totodi, 245
totondi (inf.), 320
 Tov, C. H., Review of Brinton's *The Lenape and their Legends*, 228-9
 Review of Brünnow's *Charidschiten unter den ersten Omayyaden*, 109-10
 Gatschet's Migration Legend of the Creek Indians, 228
 Trogus and Timagenes, 246
 turunda = rutunda, 120
 Uhlig's *Dionysii Thracis Ars Grammatica*, 225-7
 Unreal final sentences, 69
msns, construction, 502

Vergil:	
Georg. 1, 100-1,	250
2, 13 6,	251
Lib. IV,	389
Verrall's Studies in Horace,	204
Vespasian, Marriage of,	2-1
Vietor's Phonetische Bibliothek,	525
Vowel-length in Old English,	296-309
Vulgar-Latin bases of Romance words,	120
Walther's Vokalspiel,	256
WARREN, MINTON, Anecdota Oxoniensis,	229-30
Notice of Macaulay's Livy,	500
Welch and Duffield's Eutropius,	500
Phillipps Glossary,	451-61
Report of Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie u. Grammatik,	118-20; 252-6; 501-4
Review of Abraham's Studia Plautina,	357-8
Bréal and Bailly's Dictionnaire Étymologique Latin,	231-2
Ellis' XII Facsimiles,	232
Review of Reid's Cicero's Academica,	355-7
Review of Schenkl's Calpurnii et Nemesiani Bucolica,	499-500
WATERS, W. E., Report of Neue Jahrbücher,	234-42; 386-91; 504-12
Westcott and Hort's smaller Greek N.T.,	400
Wetzel,	256
Wiesbaden from Irish <i>uisge</i> ,	510
WHEELER, B. I., Review of Uhlig's Dionysii Thracis Ars Grammatica,	225-7
WHEELER, JOHN H., Report of Rheinisches Museum,	242-7; 378-86
WHITNEY, W. D., The <i>siz</i> and <i>sa</i> aorists in Sanskrit,	275-84
Wilkins, Epistles of Horace (noticed),	264
Winli,	256
WRIGHT, J. H., Review of D'Ooge's Sophokles' Antigone,	94-9
Xenarchos, fr. 1,	291
Xenophon:	
[R. A.] 3, 12,	505
Zenodotus vindicated,	514
Zimmer's Keltische Studien (rev.),	217-20
zustand,	260